



3 1761 11895316 5





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118953165>











CA20W  
XI  
-D23  
No. 35A



N° 35A

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 21 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 21 juin 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers





### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Monday 21 June 1993

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I want to highlight for this government the need for action on the issue of AIDS.

This past weekend a permanent AIDS memorial was unveiled in Cawthra Square Park in my riding. It was opened with a poem by Michael Lynch, whose idea the memorial was, engraved on the first pillar. Michael Lynch died before he could see the opening.

The central idea of the AIDS memorial is the naming of names. The devastation of the epidemic gets lost when it becomes a score sheet of anonymous body counts and statistics, but the listing of names has an irreplaceable impact in the fight against AIDS, particularly within the communities hardest hit.

I hope the memorial will be a place to celebrate as well the day when the last death ever from AIDS is listed.

I'm also wearing this red ribbon with respect to those haemophiliacs and HIV-T people who were infected by tainted blood or blood products and who participated in a demonstration on the steps of the Legislature today.

Our party has called on the government to act on the issue of compensation for these victims of a misplaced trust in the health care system. The government needs to act now. If need be, it should act, like Nova Scotia and Quebec before it, on its own to provide compensation.

That compensation should come after consultation with those individuals who have the most knowledge about how it could best be made; that is, the victims themselves.

##### GO BUS SERVICE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I rise in the House today to ask the Minister of Transportation to stop ignoring the people of Dufferin county and the town of Caledon when it comes to GO Transit.

This past week, while Palgrave and Bolton learned their GO bus service was being cut, the people in Dufferin and north Caledon had a private operator stop their commuter service to the Brampton GO Transit line. I have received many calls and faxes from people who rely on both services to get to and from their jobs and services within the greater Toronto area. In today's slowly recovering economy, people are faced with pay cuts and layoffs. For some people, these bus transit lines are the only form of transportation they can afford, and no one wants to lose their job or be saddled with an

unexpected and large expense of having to purchase a vehicle in today's economically trying times. In protest of these senseless cuts, the residents have reacted with action.

Everyone who is concerned, and not in favour of the loss of GO bus services, has distributed and signed a petition to show this government we disagree with the elimination of GO bus services. I have made a commitment to present these petitions in the Legislature to encourage this government to reconsider its decision. The stark reality of the situation is that not everyone can or wants to live in Metropolitan Toronto.

People should have the right to choose how they live and where they work. To make these cuts now, when jobs are scarce and money even scarcer, is a real blow to many people in Dufferin county and the town of Caledon who have been trying to rely on buses to go to work, to go to school or to go for medical services in Toronto.

##### BLOOMFIELD AND AREA BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** I rise today before the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to talk about an organization from the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings that has been very active in promoting tourism and economic development in Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings. That organization is the Bloomfield and Area Business Association.

This group is exceptional because it organizes events that bring visitors not only to Bloomfield but to the entire area. Last week they hosted a very successful event called the Loyalist Parkway Flag and Flower Festival, which is held every year on a Saturday in the middle of June. This is a celebration of the United Empire Loyalist heritage of Prince Edward county.

Bloomfield, I might add, is doing a beautiful job of restoring its town hall, which serves as a municipal office and a community centre and is used by diverse local groups. This excellent facility was the object of much admiration and is truly reflective of the kind of work that is being done all along the parkway to maintain a sense of the history of our region.

As well, this Bloomfield group also organizes the Loyalist Parkway antique and classic bicycle rally, which takes place September 25-26. This event will bring cyclists to the entire length of the Loyalist Parkway, from Trenton to Kingston. There was a modest provincial grant to promote this rally, and I know this will be put to good use in drawing attention to the Loyalist Parkway as a great area for cyclists.

This is an example of how the good work of the Bloomfield and Area Business Association benefits our



entire region. I am very pleased to have Dick and Doreen Piller here today from Prince Edward county, representing this group. In rural Ontario, there are many small communities like Bloomfield that rely on volunteers like Dick and Doreen for the kinds of events that take place. These events only happen because of the hard work and dedication of community members who take some initiative. I'd like to congratulate them on their hard work and thank them for visiting the Legislative Assembly today.

#### FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** In its continued attempt to shut down northern Ontario, the NDP government is dealing a death blow to the forest industry. In the May budget, Treasurer Laughren mentioned that the government will double its crown dues, its stumpage fees charged to forestry companies.

Up till this winter, the sawmill industry has been struggling to survive the past four years. Thanks to climatic events such as Hurricane Andrew and increased housing starts in the United States, lumber prices shot up this winter, but since that time have stabilized. But the NDP northern cabinet ministers figured this was a good time to hit the struggling industry with a doubling of the dues, starting on July 1.

While northerners are going to be celebrating Canada Day, they're also going to be seeing the shutting down of the small independent sawmills, and that means that sawmillers, loggers and truckers are going to be out of work, not because of declining prices or declining demand, but because the NDP government doesn't understand the fragile nature of the forest industry and, in their ignorance, have decided to tax it to death.

This is a plea from one northerner who cares about northern Ontario to the government to stop this tax increase now, immediately, before it's too late. The government should stop killing the northern jobs and allow us to work in northern Ontario and raise our families like anyone else.

1340

#### COMPENSATION FOR AIDS PATIENTS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Earlier this afternoon, I and my colleague Cam Jackson participated in a demonstration in which several HIV-infected haemophiliacs pleaded with the NDP government to do the right thing and provide them with injury compensation benefits.

In the gallery sit Mark and Colleen Bulbrook and Ron and Laurie Mitchell, with their sons, Nick and Josh. The only mistake that Mark and Ron made was to place their faith in the integrity of Ontario's health care system. Regrettably, their faith proved to be misplaced as each contracted HIV through the Canadian blood supply.

For many years, infected haemophiliacs have begged

the Ontario government to follow the path blazed by the federal government when it announced a compensation package to haemophiliacs in 1989. In doing so, the federal government asked the provinces to do the same. Yet haemophiliacs have been systematically denied injury compensation benefits by the four previous Liberal and NDP Health ministers.

Because the government participated in a conspiracy of denial and refused my urgings for it to take a lead on this issue, it now finds itself faced with over 60 court challenges. This could result in the government being forced to pay millions of dollars in court-ordered compensation.

By neglect and delay, the government has already inflicted enough punishment on infected haemophiliacs. While the government delays, people are dying.

This is not an issue about money; it's a question of fundamental justice. If the government continues to drag its heels, it will lose in court and the cost will be even greater. To the government I say: It's still the right time to do the right thing.

#### ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** A few weeks ago in one of my community newspapers, the Port Perry Star, there appeared an editorial with the headline "Stop Whining." The editorial goes on to say that headlines "trumpeted the budget as the largest single tax grab in Canadian history and the reaction from big business to big labour to the opposition parties at Queen's Park was as predictable as the hands on a clock.

"Liberal leader Lyn McLeod shrilled that the budget will kill the fragile recovery. This begs the question of what McLeod was saying when the Liberals were in power and hiked government spending by hefty amounts for five successive years.

"Like it or not, Canadians have to face the stark facts....

"Point fingers if you will, but never forget that the massive government debt that burdens us now has given each and every one of us a standard of living since the end of World War II unmatched anywhere on earth.

"But wait a minute. Ontarians and Canadians everywhere in this country ought to take a long, hard look around and ask themselves if there's any place in the world they would rather be.

"What we have done is put off paying for it, until now. The day of reckoning had to come.

"Stop whining and thank your lucky stars you're a Canadian. There are countless millions in every corner of the globe who would gladly step into your shoes. Wake up, take a look around, count your blessings and be thankful for what you have."

Those are the words of the editor of the Port Perry Star, and I echo them.



## SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Last week I rose in the Legislature to ask my Tory friends where they stand on Bill 48, the social contract legislation. It seems the Conservatives are still talking out of both sides of their mouths.

When the NDP began the social contract negotiations, Mike Harris clearly told Bob Rae that he could count on his party's support. By the end of April, Harris was saying, "I will support the legislation," bang, bang, bang, first, second and third reading. But by May, what were they saying?

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Here comes more "Spend, spend" by the Liberals.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Willowdale.

**Mrs Caplan:** The members of the Conservative caucus said: "This process is flawed from the beginning. It's a fly-by-the-seat-of-your-pants process." One week the Tories are saying, "I've supported the social contract talks," and the next their leader, Mike Harris, is saying, "We told you the social contract talks could not possibly succeed."

But now that we have Bill 48 before us, what are the Tories saying today? Monday, June 14, they said they might support the legislation in principle. On Wednesday, June 16, they said, "You have our support," and in the very next question that the leader asked, he was critical of the legislation. On Thursday, June 17, the Conservative Party critic said that they would vote in favour of the legislation on second reading and they would vote against the legislation on third reading.

Where do the Tories stand on Bill 48? I ask them, do you support the social contract legislation or not? Where are you? The public wants to know.

## VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** On May 17, the standing committee on administration of justice began public hearings to review the relationship between crime victims and the Ontario justice system, with particular consideration of a victims' bill of rights, which I first introduced in this chamber in 1989 and have since reintroduced three more times since it was blocked from becoming law by the Liberal and NDP governments.

During committee hearings, members had an opportunity to listen to how victims of crime feel our justice system has failed them and what they themselves would do to correct the problems in it. During her presentation, Priscilla de Villiers reminded us that the report of the coroner's inquest into Jonathan Yeo contained a recommendation for a victims' bill of rights in Ontario, one of only two provinces in Canada without one. As Priscilla stated:

"How have we got to the stage where the security of

the vulnerable members of our society is of so little account? It is time we document the fact that there is such a person as a victim and that we delineate their rights and freedoms and their place in the process. In doing that we will establish a balance of rights again, because every person in this room, believe me, is a potential victim."

Debbie Mahaffy is in the forefront of the battle against profit through continued victimization in the form of offensive serial killer cards and violent pornography films. During her presentation, she strongly urged the adoption of my private member's bill on victims' rights, especially that section that would allow the Attorney General to seize any profits derived by convicted criminals from the sale of their recollections of their crimes, which would go to pay for crime victims' services.

On behalf of these two courageous women, as mothers, we would remind members of the Legislature of what Mrs de Villiers said, that every person is a potential victim in this province.

## PETERBOROUGH GREEN-UP

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I'm delighted to report that the official opening of the new expanded Peterborough Green-Up took place on Thursday, June 10, at the home of Mrs Margeree Edwards, chair of Peterborough Utilities Commission.

Peterborough is proud to be one of the communities participating in this government's green communities initiative. Green-up is already an important part of our community and has done excellent work in auditing recycling efforts, developing the ecology garden and educating the public in many other ways.

Always a partnership program, green-up now has an even more impressive list of partners, including the Peterborough Committee on Sustainable Development, the Kawartha World Issues Centre, the city of Peterborough, the public utilities commission, the public and separate school boards, Sir Sandford Fleming College, Trent University, the Peterborough Chamber of Commerce, Consumers Gas, General Electric and Quaker Oats.

As part of its \$3-million green communities initiative, the Ministry of Environment and Energy is contributing approximately \$500,000. The key to the new green-up initiative will be the green home visit program, which has set a target of 3,000 households for the first year alone. There will be educational programs and programs targeted at business. Canada Trust is offering a special financial package. This program will help our environment, benefit our local economy and generate millions of dollars in conservation spending in Peterborough. It will create dozens of new jobs.

Thank you Clifford Maynes, Ben Wolfe, Linda Slavin, Cathy Dueck and those many others who have



helped realize this project. Welcome and good wishes to Dave McLeod, manager of the new Peterborough Green-Up.

BRIAN LAND

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I'd like to seek unanimous consent for representatives of each of the three parties to make some comments about the retirement of Mr Brian Land.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** It's a pleasure for me to rise today and to make some comments about Brian Land, who is the director of the legislative library, research and information services, and has been since April 1978.

As you will know, it was not too long after I arrived here myself that Brian Land was appointed, so in terms of service here, he has for me become not only one of the familiar services, but one of those who, in the process of dealing around the Legislature and especially in terms of access to information, I and most of us in this Legislature have come to rely on in one way or another in a very important process of informing ourselves about both the history of this place and the things that we're dealing with on a daily basis in the process of legislative debate.

1350

Brian Land began his career in 1953 as a reference librarian at the Windsor Public Library. He is the former dean of the faculty of library science at the University of Toronto and has a full professorship at the university.

Mr Speaker, you may know this fact; I didn't until we received some notes about his retirement. He is the 17th legislative librarian since Confederation in this Legislature. If you think about that, with us now some further way into the 35th Parliament, that's an interesting statistic. In that statistic Mr Land happens to be the second-longest-serving of those 17 legislative librarians. It's very important and a career here which he can be very proud of in terms of the service he has brought to this Legislature, to the members of this Legislature and I guess in some respects to many members of the public as well.

He has overseen many organizational changes and additional services that have been added during my time here and during his tenure in his job as director, including the research service itself, which didn't yet exist when I first arrived here. In that respect his stewardship has been a particularly fruitful one, in terms of how the library itself operates and in terms of how the members of this Legislature, the representatives of the public of the province of Ontario, have had access, in a much more unbiased or neutral way than perhaps many of our predecessors had, to good statistical and policy analysis of issues without the political bias that our own research

departments very often bring to those issues that we get concerned about and to good factual information that comes from both the past and the present. It has been a change that I think has added some interesting dimensions to some of the debates here in the Legislature and helped both government and opposition parties in their struggle with how to approach a debate around a particular piece of legislation.

There are several members of Mr Land's family present in the Speaker's gallery here today: his wife, Edith, and his children, Mary and John, and their spouses. His family has reason to be proud of the service that Brian has rendered here to the members of the Legislature, to the staff of the Legislature and to the larger general public of this province. I'd like to end my comments by saying both a personal thank you and a thank you on behalf of all of the members of the government caucus.

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I want to join the government House leader on behalf of my colleagues in paying tribute to Brian Land and welcoming his family here this afternoon. It seems incredible to me that it is 15 years since Brian Land came to become the executive director of the Ontario legislative library. It does seem a very short time ago that he came over here from the University of Toronto.

I don't know how to put this, but it's hard to describe the library that Mr Land came to take charge of in 1978. It was a very friendly place. It was a warm place, not particularly frequented, as I recall, by too many members of the Legislature, although the late Patrick Lawlor was one of the stalwarts, as I mentioned here a few weeks ago. But the legislative library in 1978 was quaint. It really did belong in a different era, perhaps even in a different century. Brian Land has, over the course of the past 15 years, revolutionized and modernized that facility in everything from its hiring practices, which were very interesting prior to 1978, through to introducing all of the information technology and developing, as the government House leader has rightly pointed out, a very substantial research capacity.

Why, just the other day, I received from our outgoing librarian three wonderful volumes that the library has produced having everything to do with the history of the Upper Canada Gazette to a very interesting essay on the various parliamentary precincts that the province of Ontario and its predecessors have enjoyed over the course of 200 years. He has been a very, very strong advocate for that part of our parliamentary institution. He has served with very considerable distinction in that role. It's well known, I think, to many in the Legislature that Brian has been honoured by a number of professional associations with awards of merit and achievement.

But I always felt that there was much more to Brian than just a librarian. It may not be known to some that



he served for a year as the executive assistant to the late Walter Gordon when Mr Gordon was the Minister of Finance for Canada. Around the same time, Brian wrote a book which I would recommend to those of you who have not read it.

One of the first of its kind in Canada, perhaps the first of its kind, he authored in the early 1960s a book that looked at the election campaign in the federal constituency of Eglinton, where the redoubtable Donald Fleming was taking on the challenger, Mitchell Sharp, and published that book I think in 1965, by Peter Martin and Associates, if memory serves me correctly, a very interesting volume about politics in this city in an innocent age.

But I always felt that Brian's experiences, both as a watcher of the political debates in Eglinton, as an author of that campaign, as well as his experience—and it must have been a very interesting experience; I hope he writes about it some day—serving Mr Gordon in the first year of the Pearson administration in the early 1960s made Brian Land a particularly useful member of the Board of Internal Economy, where, as executive director of the library, he had a seat for 15 years and he had an opportunity to serve honourable members in their various interests. Having spent two very memorable years myself on that assignment, it seemed to me that Brian brought a very keen understanding of the aspirations and perhaps even the foibles of politicians, which understanding he gleaned in earlier times in non-library-related activities.

I just simply want to say Brian has been a very good servant of this Legislature. I consider him a very good friend. He has set a very high and professional standard in modernizing and revolutionizing our legislative library. He has been, as I say, I think a friend to all members and we wish him well. He told me the other day he's 65. It cannot be so. He looks much more youthful than that, and he will, I know, continue to maintain a keen interest in the public affairs and the libraries of this province and country. I thank him on behalf of my colleagues and I wish him well in his new activities.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** As the longest-sitting Conservative in this Legislature, it's my privilege to pay honour to Brian Land today in his retirement from the legislative library.

I don't know if Brian or his staff keep records of who utilizes what services the most, but I would think that my use of legislative information and reference and the research services branch probably would rival any member in this Legislature, as I have an interest in many areas and have utilized those services to a great degree.

One of the great attributes of some of those services is that, although there is a wealth of information that Brian has been responsible for, I have always appreci-

ated how succinctly he has been able to captivate a particular subject or area of interest and put it in layman's language so that we can understand what in fact is happening in other jurisdictions, what people are saying about various policies across our country and what in fact I would be able to utilize during debates, during private members' bills and during other important parts that I have as a legislator.

One of the things that I think Brian has done—and he has come through a very exciting era in terms of the explosion of information services in our world and in our province—is that he has been able to put forward a very progressive set of tools for legislators to use, to allow us to have some leading-edge ideas to bring forward in this Legislature. He's given us all the tools and it's really up to us as legislators to use them.

**1400**

One of the very high standards he's been able to lead and set for the people he works for is the degree of professionalism he has been able to instil in his staff. I have never, never, even in all the uses I've had of his services, ever had any indication that any communication that I had with his services has ever been leaked or shared with anybody else without first coming and asking me if it was possible to share that information with others. I usually did share with others, because a lot of the work was very valuable.

Much has been said before by my two colleagues and I would like to associate my remarks with them as well. Brian, you set a very high standard for your successor. I know you will remember these days with a great deal of fondness. My caucus would like to congratulate you, thank you, and wish you and Edith and your family all the best in your retirement. Thank you very much.

**The Speaker:** Your executive director of the library, Mr Brian Land, has served with honour and distinction. He has demonstrated most ably that he is indeed a friend of Parliament. We thank you for the commitment you've given. We wish you well in your retirement, Brian.

ANNUAL REPORT,  
COMMISSION ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the fourth annual report of the Commission on Conflict of Interest, for the period April 1, 1992, to March 31, 1993.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY  
AND RESPONSES

LAND USE PLANNING

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** Today, I'm pleased to tell my colleagues that I've received the final report from the Commission on Planning and Development Reform in Ontario. I look forward to studying the nearly 100 recommendations in

detail over the coming months.

In receiving this report, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the commissioners who spear-headed this challenging consultation and review process. They are here with us today in the gallery: Ms Toby Vigod, Mr George Penfold and commission chair Mr John Sewell. We certainly applaud their efforts.

As many of my colleagues will know, our government appointed the commission in June 1991 when strong criticisms of Ontario's land use planning processes were surfacing. It was obvious to us that the public had little confidence in the integrity of the system and so we set out to change that system.

We gave the commission a clear-cut mandate to recommend changes to the Planning Act and related policy in order to restore public confidence, to protect public interests, to protect the natural environment and generally to make the planning process more timely and more efficient.

Mr Sewell tells me that the recommendations in the report address each of these areas, and I have every confidence that they do.

I mentioned that the commission conducted an extensive public consultation process in developing its recommendations. Allow me to share some of their activities with you.

The commission conducted some 60 public forums and town hall meetings, distributed some 30,000 copies of its draft report and received more than 2,000 submissions from individuals and groups across Ontario. I understand that a full 40% of municipalities submitted their views on the proposed changes.

These numbers indicate to me that the commissioners certainly fulfilled our provision that they consult widely with all of those who have a stake in land use planning.

I understand from Mr Sewell and the commissioners that substantial changes were made to the final report, based on concerns expressed about recommendations in the draft report. I am pleased to hear this—

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I hope Morley Kells didn't get to them.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Well, Morley Kells happens to agree with a lot of them—particularly because I am told some of the changes address concerns raised by people living in rural Ontario. I look forward to seeing the changes because I think any time people's ideas and concerns are acted upon, the result is a more responsive and meaningful system.

Thank you again to the commissioners for a job well done and on time, I might add. Thank you so much.

I believe all the members have also received copies of the final report and I would urge you to read this important document. I look forward to studying this report in great detail.

#### FIRST NATIONS SOLIDARITY DAY

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** I rise today to remind members of an important event now under way. It's an event of significance not only in Ontario but throughout Canada. It's an event evocative of a time that predates either of these jurisdictions and recalls cultures more tuned to the land itself than to boundaries drawn on it.

June 21 is First Nations Solidarity Day, an opportunity to reflect on the heritage unique to Canada that began before Europeans set foot on North American shores.

As legislators, we might particularly note that the traditions of government we are guided by today do not flow from the earliest political organization of present-day Ontario. We are in fact relative newcomers to the task of governing in Canada.

The history of aboriginal peoples is at the foundation of First Nations Solidarity Day. But this special occasion also celebrates optimism for the future and a united involvement in the present.

For example, this morning on Manitoulin Island in West Bay First Nation, sacred ceremonies and prayers began a week-long gathering of elders from all across the country. The elders are discussing cultural survival, self-determination and the future of aboriginal nations. The intent is that the knowledge and wisdom of the elders, with their concerns for social order and harmony, will spark the will of first nations leaders to form a sound base for self-government, which includes participation of all community members.

Many other aboriginal communities in Ontario undertook awareness gatherings, powwows and celebrations over the weekend, with yet more to come. These gatherings celebrate growing solidarity within native communities towards preservation and sharing of aboriginal cultures, languages and traditions, and to the goal of self-governance as well. Ontario has pledged its support to these goals.

In August 1991, I was honoured to sign, along with the Premier, a historic agreement between the province and the first nations in Ontario. The Statement of Political Relationship established the fundamental principle that Ontario and first nations will relate on a government-to-government basis, while recognizing that first nations have an inherent right to self-government.

Ontario is currently discussing self-government proposals and land claims issues with a number of aboriginal communities. We are also demonstrating our commitment to the Statement of Political Relationship through an approach that has involved virtually every ministry in this government.

Aboriginal health, for example, is a key issue within Ontario's aboriginal reform agenda. Government is working in partnership with aboriginal organizations to



develop new and lasting solutions directed at holistic healing. We believe significant steps towards healing are essential to improved social and economic wellbeing of aboriginal people, and we are developing a comprehensive strategy to support aboriginal family healing.

The Jobs Ontario program includes training and job creation to meet the particular needs of aboriginal people. Initiatives by the Solicitor General supporting aboriginal policing and justice have demonstrated encouraging success to date. New fishing agreements between Ontario and native peoples will protect the province's fisheries while honouring aboriginal and treaty rights, and aboriginal language training, through our native-as-a-second-language school programs, is helping to preserve a core element of native culture.

This year, First Nations Day falls in the midst of the United Nations' International Year of the World's Indigenous People, hence all the more reason to turn our attention today to Ontario's best approach to the aboriginal community. Ontario's approach begins with the recognition that aboriginal people best understand their own aspirations. It is for them to define their goals in self-government.

As to the nature of those goals, a look to the past may be helpful. Iroquoian tradition offers us the wampum belt, a treaty document that uses parallel lines of beads to represent two canoes moving in the same river, in the same direction, and illustrating peaceful coexistence between equal peoples in a common land.

To me, these traditions tell us a hopeful story. They remind us of the human capacity for relationships, political or personal, less concerned with giving or taking and more concerned with sharing.

I'm proud to take this opportunity today to introduce an individual who combines the best of those traditions of his people with his own personal capabilities, and at the same time, gives back to his people, particularly the young people of his community, an individual who has overcome adversity to reach the top in his field. He is a credit to his people, a credit to the Garden River First Nation, a credit to his sport, to his hockey club and to his profession of coaching. I'm proud to introduce to the Legislature today Mr Ted Nolan, the coach of the national Junior A hockey champions in Canada, the Memorial Cup champions, the Sault Ste Marie Greyhounds.

1410

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** I too would like to welcome Ted to the Legislature and join the minister in recognizing this, the First Nations Solidarity Day.

Before I go on, Mr Speaker, I might suggest that you may look for medical help for the minister responsible for native affairs. I actually think he threw his elbow out in patting himself on the back. I certainly expected a less self-serving statement.

As a member who represents a riding with some 25 first nation communities, I cannot stress the importance of this day to those communities throughout the riding of Kenora.

Let me pick up on part of the statement made by the minister which states: "Aboriginal people best understand their own aspirations. It is for them to define their goals in self-government." If I can say anything about this, I would hope that this is something this government will take seriously and appreciate and understand what this particular statement means.

In closing, I would just like to mention a very significant event happening in Kenora this week which parallels this particular day, that being the northern justice conference. It has drawn people from around the world actually to discuss the justice system among the first nations, with a focus on both family and healing. I must suggest this is only one of a great number of activities that are taking place throughout the province during this most important week. I really sincerely hope this government will listen to the recommendations that are made by this group and other first nation groups across the province.

#### LAND USE PLANNING

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** In response to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the John Sewell commission, you will recall that the John Sewell commission was announced in this House with great fanfare. It was supposed to become the 11th commandment of the Planning Act, but it never did.

Today, after two long years of consultation—I must agree with the minister that a great deal of consultation went on in the province of Ontario—and after spending \$2.2 million, mind you, out of a budget of a possible \$6 million, it's not too bad, but the accomplishments, the results of the report are not too impressive.

As you will recall, Mr Sewell was asked to streamline the Planning Act. This is not the first time that a government has tried to streamline the Planning Act to improve the process, but I think the government and the minister are adding another layer of bureaucracy. The final report recommends that yet another layer of bureaucracy be added to the planning process, ironically in order to streamline the process. The report recommends that regional planning review committees of interested ministries be established and that provincial approvals be delegated to ministry staff of those committees.

I think Mr Sewell tried to give municipalities more responsibilities. I realize that maybe 40% of our municipalities responded in writing to the John Sewell report, but not too many agreed with him. Not too many municipalities. Minister, you will recall that you received a number of letters from municipalities saying: "No way. We cannot approve this report."

The report says that we will protect agricultural land, we will protect wetlands, we will protect every ravine in the province of Ontario, yet only three or four short weeks ago, we dealt with the largest amalgamation the province of Ontario has ever seen, the London-Middlesex amalgamation; 75% of the land in this amalgamation was good agricultural land, yet the intention of the London-Middlesex amalgamation was to provide them with more commercial and industrial land.

What Mr Sewell is recommending and what your government and your ministries are doing are two different things. It's not going to work. I don't know what OMB will say about this. I realize that you've given the OMB more powers with intervenor funding, but you have turned it down in the past, telling it, "You will get no additional commissioners." How can you resolve the John Sewell problem?

#### FIRST NATIONS SOLIDARITY DAY

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I'm responding to the statement from the minister responsible for native affairs. I don't see anything in this statement that's new or different or moving us further into the 21st century, but there is a comment about the statement of political relationship. I'm happy to see that that statement of political relationship is being responded to with fishing agreements, hunting agreements, recognition of policing, many aspects.

But the one thing that really strikes me about this statement is the very first paragraph, where there is a recognition by this minister, who I might tell you is also the minister responsible for the environment. He recalls in his statement "a culture more attuned to the land itself than to boundaries drawn on it." What the minister is saying and recognizing is that the first nations of this country are the stewards of the land. They are the wisest users of the land. They are the people who understand the importance of the land.

The importance of this statement, it seems to me, is a recognition by the minister to learn from those who are the wisest, and that is the native community. I ask the minister, in his capacity as Minister of Environment and Energy, why he wants to put garbage dumps on farm land, why he wants to put garbage dumps adjacent to the Rouge? I think it's incumbent upon the minister to back up, to change his policy and to understand what those who are wisest in dealing with this problem would say about it.

#### LAND USE PLANNING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I want to respond to the statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When this process all started, it was really to bring things into line so that municipalities would be streamlined, would not have to wait so long in the approval process. I'm wondering, is the government listening to what this report is saying in that regard?

The other aspect of the report in terms of the whole process is with regard to the Minister of Environment and Energy. Now it takes up to a year to get approval. The hydrogeology studies sit there for month after month. Is this process going to speed up that end of it? If it is, it's worth it.

The other aspect I'm talking about is septic systems: the septic system inspection user fee. Every five years they'll have to be inspected and it'll be paid by the owner of that property. This is a whole new aspect being put in, and it's another downloading by the province. What's going to happen to rural schools? Are they going to be able to get approvals for septic systems? The minister of the environment said it would not happen. Is that going to be part of this whole report, that they will be able to do that?

Farm severances will be non-existent; therefore, poor land will be left for no use at all.

The other process is with regard to the OMB, the intervenor funding. If we look at that whole aspect of funding, the \$500 million that's in there is not much when it comes to the province of Ontario as a whole.

There are some positive recommendations in the report, but I'm looking forward to see if you're going to act on them.

1420

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I rise to address the report of my former colleague John Sewell.

I think perhaps at the outset the objectives Mr Sewell looked at were very admirable in terms of the integrity and clarity of the planning process, in terms of the timeliness of the planning process—because we know it can take up to 13 months for an Ontario Municipal Board hearing—and the protection of the environment.

However, I must say that there are concerns with regard to the emphasis on policy statements, policy statements that apparently would be devised through interministerial committees, apparently would have only up to three months in terms of public input. I would urge the government to allow more time for public input to the policy statements. These policy statements are very central to the planning process that Mr Sewell contemplates.

There are, in addition, concerns with regard to builders in our province, that Mr Sewell's report would essentially prohibit the building of single-family homes. There are concerns in local municipalities that they would lose authority to the upper-tier municipalities. There are concerns that the official plan amendments would become more complicated, that all alternatives would have to be investigated, that the official plan process would become about as complicated as the environmental assessment process. The intervenor funding is of concern as well. I believe these concerns should be addressed in detail by the government.



## ORAL QUESTIONS

## TRANSFER PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** In the absence of both the Premier and the Deputy Premier, I'll direct my first question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I trust that the minister has been following the statements that have been made by the Premier in relationship to the social contract negotiations that are supposed to be beginning. If he has been following them, the Premier has told us on a number of occasions that where municipalities, school boards, hospitals, colleges and universities had already negotiated wage freezes or unpaid leaves, these measures would be "taken into account"—and those are the Premier's words—in the social contract negotiations.

The minister is certainly well aware that on Friday he released detailed information of transfer cuts to each municipality in the province under the social contract. Will you indicate to us today whether municipalities which had in fact already negotiated wage freezes or unpaid leaves had those measures "taken into account" in the transfer reductions which you are making as of July 1?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** If the honourable Leader of the Opposition will read the legislation, as I'm sure she has, she can see that flexibility is built into that, and the whole concept that we have emphasized at the social contract table is to deal with that kind of flexibility. Indeed, when I spoke to the clerks' meeting this morning in London, I emphasized that. The way in which to deal with that is to get back to the social contract table and we will deal with all of the issues they are concerned about.

Let me just remind the honourable leader of the official opposition that the Premier, I think as she well knows, is at a funeral for a long-standing friend of ours and member of the House, Mr Bud Germa, who we greatly note has passed away.

**Mrs McLeod:** I was indeed aware of that, which is why I'm specifically asking the question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who should be able to give us a very clear answer on the issue of the municipal transfer payments and how they are affected by the social contract negotiations.

If I've understood the minister's response to me correctly, he must be implying that there is flexibility in the transfer announcements that were given to the municipalities last week.

The Premier indicated clearly last week that any wage freezes, any unpaid leaves already in place, would clearly be taken into account. That's right, it did imply flexibility in the negotiations, and therefore flexibility in the financial targets that the municipalities and other agencies would have to meet.

We have been able to get absolutely no explanation of how this is going to be done. We've used examples: the city of Hamilton, which has already had a wage freeze and unpaid leaves ranging from 15 days to three weeks; the much smaller municipality of Atikokan, which has already shut down its offices for a day a week; and there are countless other examples.

We are asking, if you haven't taken these measures into account already, how are you going to do it, when are you going to do it, where are you going to do it? If the factors are going to be taken into account during the negotiations, will you adjust the cuts that you're making in transfer payments as a result, and when will municipalities know exactly what they have to work with?

**Hon Mr Philip:** I think that what the Premier indicated and what certainly I've indicated to municipalities, indeed to the clerks this morning, is that the flexibility is in how they reach their targets. There are no blanket exemptions for any municipality or group of municipalities.

**Mrs McLeod:** There are negotiations beginning, or at least you expect negotiations to begin, and nobody understands what the ground rules are. The Premier has said comprehensive solutions won't work, but you're legislating broad-brush, comprehensive solutions anyway. Then the Premier says, "No, there will not be any blanket exemptions, but special circumstances are going to be taken into account." I tell you, Minister, this is simply mass confusion.

Let me assume that the Premier's promise, his very clear statement that in some way it would be recognized where people had already made a substantial sacrifice or where they have already taken some steps, that somehow the Premier's words are going to be acted on. That means there are going to be some special cases taken into consideration somewhere or somehow. I have to ask, then, how is the government going to find its \$2 billion? Will those municipalities that don't get special-case consideration have to make up the difference for those municipalities that do get special consideration if you're going to reach that municipal sector target of \$285 million?

**Hon Mr Philip:** There certainly was no confusion among the clerks of the municipalities this morning when I talked to them; they understood. And there were representatives of AMO at that meeting this morning in London; they understood that with any concerns they had, there was a process set up by this government, the process was at the table and that they could bring those concerns to that table and we would look at ways of dealing with those concerns. I'm glad to say that they understood that, the municipalities understood that, and they're willing to cooperate.

**Mrs McLeod:** The minister gets a very different message than we receive, which is a very clear message from the municipalities that says: "Take out your



arbitrary conditions. Let us meet your targets in our own way. Don't bring these broad-brush solutions and trap us with them."

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question would be to the Minister of Health. Minister, last week you introduced legislation to give yourself sweeping powers to determine what medical services a patient can receive and to prescribe under what conditions those services can be provided. When I asked you how you and the Ministry of Health bureaucrats would make the decisions, you said, "It's our intent, it's our desire, it's our expectation that we will continue to make those decisions in consultation with all the people involved."

But you have also indicated just as clearly that if your negotiations with the Ontario Medical Association are not successful, you will unilaterally determine what medical services will be limited. We continue to be concerned about this power and to ask how you would intend to make these decisions, as no one has any confidence in the ability of a minister or a bureaucrat to make decisions about what care a patient needs. What does this bill that you have before this House do to ensure that patients in Ontario can have confidence in their health care system?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** First of all, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that no minister or no bureaucrat intends to practise medicine for the province of Ontario. What we intend to do is to manage our health care system in such a way that it remains affordable, accessible and that the quality of care is not imperilled.

1430

What we have done this year is to identify savings that must be achieved within the ministry in order to enable us to in fact make some shifts to reform the process, a reform of health care that has been talked about for many years and has been begun under this government. In how in fact we reach that target, we very much want to negotiate with the OMA, and we have put on the table two specific proposals with respect to insured services which we believe can be achieved and help us to achieve our target. If there are alternatives, if there are in fact other ways of achieving those savings, we want to do that in consultation at the negotiating table, and the legislation allows us to reach that target. It does not prescribe how in fact we get there.

**Mrs McLeod:** I feel as though every time I ask you a question to clarify what it is you intend to do with this unprecedented legislation, I get more confused and more concerned about exactly what your intent is. You keep telling us that you have made it clear what you intend to do. All of us are looking at one another and saying, "When did Ruth Grier make it clear what she

intends to do with this legislation?"

You tell us you don't intend to use the powers; you intend to negotiate; you're not going to make decisions about what is medically necessary. We keep saying, why, then, are you bringing in legislation that gives you such incredibly sweeping powers to make these kinds of medical decisions on behalf of patients?

The legislation is clear. It gives you, as the Minister of Health, the ability in law to decide what services a patient will receive and to prescribe the conditions under which the patient will receive those services.

You have not made it clear how this bill serves the purpose of limiting costs and still provides effective and essential medical care, and I ask you to tell us, then, very specifically, exactly what kind of medical services, what kind of procedures you intend to limit in implementing this legislation.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me give a straightforward answer: whatever procedures, whatever services, in consultation with the OMA, we are satisfied will enable us to reach our financial targets without putting at risk the quality of health care in this province.

**Mrs McLeod:** What you want to do then is withdraw your legislation, because you do not need this bill and you should not have it. Surely you understand that this legislation gives you the legal power to make medically necessary decisions on behalf of the patients of this province, and you yourself are saying you don't want and would not exercise those powers. Then don't put them into legislation.

We ask you what kind of restrictions you would ever consider putting in place under this legislation. You will not give us any specific examples, because clearly you have either not thought it through or you really don't intend to use the powers. Again, we say if you don't intend to use them, don't put those powers into legislation today.

We ask you, what is it—tell us once again—that you would ever consider to be medically unnecessary, and tell me too that if you should need to implement the powers under this legislation and you decide that something is not needed but the patient decides that it is needed and the patient's doctor believes it is needed, are you just going to send the patient the bill? Can the patient appeal to you? Are you now, under this law, going to become the final arbiter of what is universally accessible health care in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** This legislation has nothing to do with individual patient care or the power of a physician to practise medicine in this province. What it has to do is enable the ministry to achieve a target containing expenditures and to do it in a way that protects the medicare system but gives us the ability to manage it for the first time by consultation with the profession around services. But there are many other aspects of this



legislation that enable us to manage the system in a way that we have been prevented from doing so in the past, and that has led to an escalating increase in expenditures without a commensurate increase in the quality of care.

#### HOUSING POLICY

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** My question is for the Minister of Housing. Today I received a new report by Clayton Research Associates called *The Cost of a Shelter Allowance Program in Ontario*.

As the minister knows, Clayton is the foremost firm on housing economics in Canada. Clayton finds that for a cost of \$383 million a year, or a monthly average of \$114 per household, we could provide shelter allowances for all 279,000 renter households that are in core housing need. By contrast, the average non-profit housing subsidy was \$942 a month in April of this year.

We now have a creditable and up-to-date study which finds that shelter allowances are much more affordable than non-profit subsidies. Why then are you expanding the non-profit housing program and ignoring the option of a shelter allowance program for renter households that are in core housing need?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I haven't had the benefit of reading the report to which the member for Mississauga South refers, but I'm sure I'll read it with interest. I'd like her to explain how it is that such an estimate of what it would cost to provide rental subsidies for households in need can be made when the cost under social assistance, where people are in the private market, is much higher than that. We're spending \$2.5 billion a year in shelter allowances currently. How much more would she like to spend?

**Mrs Marland:** I'm not the Minister of Housing yet, but I've done my homework. I read the Clayton report this morning. I just think it's unfortunate the minister didn't have her staff brief her.

Maybe I'll help the minister. I'll summarize some of the conclusions of the Clayton study.

First, a shelter allowance program is more affordable than non-profit housing.

Second, a shelter allowance program would help all those in the needy target group who wish to apply. Right now, unless a needy tenant receives welfare or family benefits, there is no help until a unit becomes available in one of your social housing projects.

Third, shelter allowances would allow tenants to remain in their current homes if they choose, so that they can be close to their families, to child care, to schools and to workplaces.

Fourth, shelter allowances avoid the low-income ghettos which can occur in social housing projects that do not have a mix of incomes.

For these reasons, will you cancel the non-profit

housing that you have announced but have not yet built and will you establish in its place a shelter allowance program for the renters in core housing need?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I'd like to comment particularly on the part of the member's question that relates to assistance for people who are not on social assistance at the moment. This is indeed a very significant problem. It affects people both who are renting in the private market and also people who are in their own homes paying a mortgage and who run into income problems.

The way to address that kind of problem is not to drop non-profit housing, which is the only source of new, affordable rental housing that will last for decades, that provides construction jobs while it gets built and that is a public asset which is a good investment for this society. The way to address that, if the member would think about it, is to look at our social assistance system and to make sure that working families that are not on social assistance rolls can get some help when they have costs that relate to the size of their family, where the number of children in the family means that the income in the household is too low. We are engaged in social assistance reform work and the member will be able to read a white paper on social assistance reform within a matter of weeks.

**Mrs Marland:** For a moment there, I thought she got it. She said there is a very significant problem. Then she lost it. When you talk about your solution, you're quite right: non-profit housing will last for decades, because for decades the taxpayers in this province will be paying to look after a fewer number of households compared to what they could look after outside the non-profit housing program. That's the whole point, and it's unfortunate that you really don't get it.

1440

You like to point out that the province already spends a great deal on shelter allowances. What you never admit is that shelter allowances for welfare recipients are still much cheaper than non-profit housing subsidies. The average shelter allowance for a welfare recipient is \$354 a month, compared to \$942 a month for non-profit housing. Shelter allowances could cost even less: an average, I just said, of \$114 a month for these needy tenants who are not getting any help right now.

By April 1993, the Ontario government had built 87,000 units of non-profit housing. With another 46,000 units to be built by 1998, we could cancel the 46,000 units and save over \$400 million a year.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mrs Marland:** My question is, based on the fact that \$400 million a year is more than enough to cover the costs of a shelter allowance program for rentals in core housing need, Minister, when is your government going to look for ways to provide more services for less



money, and why are you ignoring the obvious benefits of cutting back non-profit housing and setting up a shelter allowance program for these needy core rental households?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** If there is somebody who doesn't get it, it's the member opposite. You can't have a program to assist people in housing need in this province that only has one wheel. Shelter allowances, rental subsidies, no matter what you call them, do not answer a need that keeps growing and will not in the least answer the question of where we're going to get new affordable rental supply. We can't simply keep pouring money into paying for housing that exists on the market now as affordable rental. The need is growing year by year, the member has to acknowledge that, and we have to keep increasing the supply.

There is no doubt about the fact that rental subsidy programming has a place in housing policy. We spend \$80 million currently. But the fact is that if we want to have a new affordable supply, only the kind of financing available under a non-profit program will provide that supply.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** No wonder we're broke in the province of Ontario with an answer like that.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Minister, when your government took office in 1990, the unemployment rate was 6%. This year the economists who came before the finance and economics committee said it will range anywhere from 10.6% to 11.8%, almost double since your government has been in office.

In the 1992 budget you said you were going to make jobs a priority, and during the year of 1992 well over 500,000 people each and every month were unemployed in the province of Ontario. My question to you, Minister, is this: Why have your plans failed for the unemployed in this province and what are you going to do to assist the private sector to create the jobs we need in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I don't think that I would agree with the assertion that the plans have failed. I think that we have a multifaceted package with respect to the economy and with respect to job development.

We can certainly look at the number of jobs, thousands of jobs, that have been created through Jobs Ontario Capital, Jobs Ontario Youth, through the housing programs under Jobs Ontario, as well as the previous housing programs, and specifically with respect to leveraged investments in areas like Ford and Chrysler, Bombardier—the recent announcement that it's going to increase the number of jobs in Thunder

Bay. It's the first time ever that in fact we've had a covenant from Bombardier with respect to employment levels in a community.

There are a number of areas in which we are moving forward which we also hope will be an investment in the future of the economy, and I can perhaps provide more detail through the supplementary, but areas like the sector partnership fund, some of the cooperative ventures that are going there. I think that our approach to the economy, a shift from picking winners and losers to a shift to supporting winning activities like innovation, like home-based activities, like investment in technology and export readiness, will pay off certainly both in the short term and, more substantially, in the long term for this province.

**Mr Carr:** The only shift we got is that we're in the process of laying off nurses, doctors, teachers at a time when you're pouring money into the business of this province. There will never, never be enough money in this province to subsidize all the programs. What you need to do is create a business environment that will allow the private sector to create jobs. You've got to realize that. At a time when we're talking about rolling back and laying off nurses, teachers, doctors, we need to upscale the private sector.

I want to read a quote from Mr Pat Palmer, who came in before the chamber. He said: "Never in the past half-century have business conditions in Ontario been as bad: a record number of bankruptcies, a chilling number of plant closures and layoffs. See our blood; no more taxes. Tax increases will only make the deficit position worse and subsequently put even more pressure on our social programs."

I want to be very specific to this minister, as it relates to taxes and to regulation. What are you doing about the overtaxing and the overregulating that are killing jobs in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The member opposite will know that in fact our approach in this budget has been one in which, as part of our approach to the economy, we've said that we have to take steps with respect to the provincial government's fiscal situation. I think the emphasis on turning around the deficit-debt problem in this province is one that is supported, by and large, by Ontarians. I think we've taken an approach to that which is fair and equitable that does include increasing revenues at a period in time which is difficult, as it is difficult to decrease expenditures and to address the programs that we are suggesting through the social contract.

With respect to taxation in particular, I would remind the member opposite to take a look at our competitive tax situation with respect to jurisdictions most closely related to our economy: those in surrounding United States Great Lakes jurisdictions.



We will, by next year, be among the lowest in terms of tax rates to corporations in those areas. We have taken specific initiatives with respect to corporate tax rates. The corporate concentration tax is another example. We're working on problems with Ontario Hydro, like the rate and costs of energy, the costs of doing business—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** You guys just don't want to tax corporations. What's going on?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The tremendous efforts we've been making with respect to bringing health care costs under control in this province—

**Mr Sorbara:** What's happened to you guys?

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for York Centre.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** —over one third of the expenditure of the Ontario government, will be a significant contributor to our competitive situation.

I point also to what's been done by the Premier's Labour-Management Advisory Committee.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** All of these areas with respect to the costs of doing business are areas that we are working on. They will make a tremendous contribution in the future to these companies. In the meetings that I hold with people from various business jurisdictions, they acknowledge that and recognize that.

**Mr Carr:** The more she works, the more the jobs get lost in the province of Ontario. I want to tell the minister that I have in my hand—

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Every year you've been working on it. Get to work. Stop working on it.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Sorbara:** Just like that, we stop shouting.

**The Speaker:** The member for Oakville South with his final supplementary.

**Mr Carr:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The minister might think she's doing a good job, but in my hands I have a survey done by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business which shows the most important problems.

It is the small businesses that are creating the jobs in the province of Ontario. My friends across the other side snicker, but at a time when you're laying off nurses, teachers and doctors, it's the private sector and the small businesses that are creating jobs that you're laughing at. They're the jobs that are being created.

They say the number one problem is the total tax burden. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association says it takes seven hours and 52 minutes to cover costs, and only in the remaining eight minutes are they able to

produce the revenue needed to pay tax and to pay for your programs. If a page will come over, I'll send this over to the minister.

We have also put together in our minority report some ideas dealing with taxation, government spending, social assistance, non-profit housing, government regulations and the Workers' Compensation Board. We're attempting to put some practical, commonsense solutions together.

I would say to the minister, which of these recommendations are you going to implement and when are you going to implement them, so we can get people back to work in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I just finished running through a long list of initiatives we are taking with respect to the cost structures to Ontario business. I point out to the member opposite that with the cuts in corporate income tax that were announced in the 1992 federal and provincial budgets, in fact manufacturing firms in Ontario will benefit greatly. By 1994 the combined statutory federal-provincial state corporate income tax will be significantly lower in Ontario than it will be in some of our competitive states around the Great Lakes.

1450

The member opposite seems to ignore those points that are made in response to his questions, particularly with respect to a number of the other issues I outlined in response that our government has.

He also talks about regulatory burden. We have a very well developed initiative within the ministry with respect to clearing the regulatory burden and the paperwork burden, particularly for small business.

I note that the member likes to quote leaders of various business associations. He may want to read the quote from Pat Palmer, which also applauded the work we're doing on that, in which we are going to be involving the chambers of commerce and representatives of other business associations with us in that vein.

With respect to the number of jobs being created, I think it's really important that the member give credit where credit is due. I believe our government is due credit with respect to Jobs Ontario Capital, Jobs Ontario Training, the housing programs, the community economic development programs.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** In this last month alone, I've announced loans to the Ontario Development Corp that have sustained 200 jobs and created 300 new jobs in the province of Ontario in small business. That's keeping Ontario working.

#### PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Last day I rose in the House to point out to the government, on behalf of members of the House and the people of



Ontario—this is to the Chair of Management Board—that the government was squandering \$1.4 million on polls to tell itself what it thought about the various issues of the day.

Those of us who read the weekend newspapers noticed a full-page ad that appeared in many of the major metropolitan dailies in the province of Ontario under the signature of the Premier of the province of Ontario.

Taking into context the times we're in, in light of the fact that the government is cutting back on essential services to people in this province because of the economic circumstances that the government faces, in light of the fact that you are prepared to break contracts and raid the pension funds of public sector workers in the province, in this context how can this government possibly justify the expenditure of thousands of dollars when it's trying to send out the opposite message? How can you justify that kind of expenditure on full-page ads in the various newspapers in the province to put out the government's line?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** The member opposite is precisely a reflection of the reason that the government is having to do what it has to do.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The member opposite chose in his preamble to his question to repeat a set of allegations, which are not factual, about stripping of pension plans. The kinds of allegations that have been made by some deserve a clear public response. The public of this province deserves a full, clear and factual understanding of precisely what it is this government has proposed so that it can make the appropriate judgements.

**Mr Bradley:** I'm almost afraid to ask another question because I'm liable to provoke another full-page ad in the newspapers of Ontario.

There is nothing in this ad that hasn't already been reported by the popular media across the province of Ontario. There's been extensive coverage of this by the media—and I know Brian Mulroney does this and you wouldn't like that.

But my question is this: In light of the fact that the Premier of this province, in opposition in the December 14, 1983, debate in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, said the following about this kind of government advertising, "It is an abuse of power, it is an abuse of the democratic process, and governments which participate in it should be ashamed of themselves"—

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** Who said that, Jim?

**Mr Bradley:** That was none other than the Premier of this province today, Bob Rae. Now, in view of the fact that he said this, in view of the fact that you have squandered money on polls to tell you what you think,

and now full-page ads to go along with the other self-serving propaganda you put out, will you now give an undertaking to the House that in the context of these economic times, when you're asking others to make sacrifice, you will discontinue this kind of self-serving propaganda?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The member opposite asked me for some kind of a commitment. I'm going to suggest to the member opposite that perhaps he should spend some time and come over to our side and look at the calls we've had, for example, as a result of the budget publication, which we put out as an insert in all of the dailies across the province, calls which clearly indicate—that's a different document, Jim, different document—that the vast majority of the public across this province appreciated that modest expenditure because it was the only way they could get an accurate picture of what it was the government had proposed.

This government will continue to ensure that the public of the province of Ontario has an accurate and full and clear understanding of what its government is doing.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** My question is for the Minister of Citizenship—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Cousens:** I'll try not to provoke another ad. They're spending money badly in the Human Rights Commission, so let's just follow up on how the Human Rights Commission, which is now costing three times what it did in 1985, over \$15 million a year—and for this we're receiving a service that is very seriously backlogged. One of the reasons for this is the lack of a screening process to differentiate those cases that really should be proceeded with.

A case in point is the adult magazines that are being sold in corner stores. Already the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that stores can sell these adult magazines when municipal bylaws are in place. Why would your Human Rights Commission now proceed with those cases, spending money, taking additional time when there's already a serious backlog, and the fact that of the three cases that were being considered, one of them has already been thrown out? I ask you, will you throw out the other two cases that are before the Human Rights Commission so that the Human Rights Commission can deal with its backlog?

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship and Minister Responsible for Human Rights, Disability Issues, Seniors' Issues and Race Relations):** I think I have to clarify a few points for the member opposite who I think is very well versed in the Human Rights Commission proceedings, but I would like to clarify for the general public, because he has raised some very



interesting comments that I think need an explanation.

First of all, the Ontario human rights commissioners sit down and decide what cases go before a board of inquiry. They then ask the minister to appoint a board of inquiry. Under the system that we have, under the Human Rights Code—which was brought forward, by the way, by a previous government, a Conservative government—it states very clearly that the minister must appoint a board of inquiry that the commissioners have requested. It is out of my hands to make any decisions about whether a board of inquiry is assigned or not. It's completely out of my hands whether a minister can decide to drop a case or not to drop a case once a board of inquiry has been appointed.

1500

**Mr Cousens:** It becomes a very serious concern when the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled on an issue, and then the Ontario Human Rights Commission takes it up as an issue and crusade for it to follow through on. Three cases are before the Human Rights Commission. One of the three is thrown out. Yet the cost of these cases and the time they take continue to raise the whole issue of if the Human Rights Commission were to sort out and remove from its backlog those subjects that have been dealt with in other courts or other areas, and not take the time of the commission or the cost of those that are involved because they've been dealt with otherwise.

Therefore, why doesn't the minister deal with the real issue and get on with the backlog, an ongoing, increasing backlog, deal with that and stay out of issues that have already been dealt with by other jurisdictions and other courts?

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** The member opposite raises another point that I'd like to have clarified, and that is that the Human Rights Commission is a quasi-judicial system, a system that should be without political interference. I think that in this province and in this country we would have great difficulty with having any political interference with the Human Rights Commission. This must be an arm's-length relationship with no political interference. I take great offence when I think that the member opposite would even request that a political person interfere with the system in place.

#### MEDICAL LABORATORIES

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** My question is for the Minister of Health. It concerns the review of health care services in Ontario. For the sake of expediency, I think I could probably place my question and supplementary together, so there won't be any repetition.

Minister, the private labs in Ontario offer their services to everyone and are not restricted to serving only on premises. These labs have become an integral part of our society and our communities. I know that in

the riding of Kitchener-Wilmot these labs make house calls to individuals who are unable to go to labs, as well as to senior citizens' complexes. There is great concern in my riding as to what will happen to private labs, in particular MDS Laboratories and by extension the people who work at them.

We must remember their contribution. Over 8,000 people are employed in private labs. They offer fast, reliable and convenient services. Many are owned by employees through profit-sharing programs. Commercial labs service over 10 million patients. They are community-based and provide specialized services for seniors. The constituents in my riding have very real concerns about the reduction or closure of these labs.

What is the status of the review of these labs and can you give any assurance that private labs will have a place in a restructured, comprehensive health care program in Ontario?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I'm glad to respond and appreciate the fact that the member has said he doesn't have a supplementary. Perhaps I can take some time to explain to the House that in an effort to better manage commercial laboratory expenditures and to keep the cost at an affordable level, the ministry, in consultation with the Ontario Association of Medical Laboratories, instituted several policy changes over the last couple of years which resulted in savings of \$25 million and \$11 million respectively.

In November 1992, we initiated a laboratory services review which was to address all the major issues regarding the provision of quality laboratory services, such as the need for utilization management, the best structures to create a system and the roles of the different sectors, as well as the funding mechanisms and human resource management.

This review has been done with all of the various stakeholders and certainly in consultation with the association. The recommendations are currently being prepared, and I am assured that the review will meet its target of taking one year and that we will have the final report from that in November of this year.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. My question relates to the Ontario-Quebec trade barriers, especially in the construction industry. Madam Minister, you will know that the construction industry, especially in the Ottawa-Carleton area, is affected by what is happening in the province of Ontario. Quebec companies are winning contracts and construction workers are getting jobs in the province of Ontario while Ontarians are being shut out of the Quebec market. We think it's very unfair.

The CMIT, the committee of ministers on internal trade, met last week to decide how to break all commer-



cial barriers between provinces. You will recall that their decision wasn't a very good one. The best timetable they could come up with was that legislation could be introduced in 1995. This is unacceptable. We need action now. We need to protect the construction industry right across the province of Ontario.

Can the minister tell this House what action she will take to resolve this dispute between Quebec and Ontario? Are you ready to meet with your Quebec counterpart by the end of this month to figure a way out of this impasse?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I appreciate the question from the member opposite. I've had many discussions with a number of members from the Ottawa area on all sides of the House with respect to this issue and also with members from northern Ontario, who have a similar problem with respect to, particularly, the issue of construction procurement and mobility of labour in the construction trades.

I'd like to correct one impression that the member may have inadvertently left the viewing public with, with respect to the ministers of internal trade, or interprovincial trade, meeting, which was that a new agenda has been agreed upon which would not see action until 1995.

In fact, we are pursuing an already agreed-to agenda which sees discussions continuing over the course of this summer and the development of a rolling agreement, negotiations to commence directly in the fall at a number of tables, involving various groups of ministers, whether it be with respect to agriculture, the environment or broader issues that ministers responsible for interprovincial trade will maintain the responsibility for. We expect to have conclusion to those negotiations in place by this time next year, and that would be followed on by actions implemented by provinces, as well as legislation to back it up.

Specifically with respect to the issue of Quebec and Ontario, as you know, I've taken the position to support the agreement of the interprovincial ministers of trade not to institute any new barriers and to respect the moratorium on barriers at this point in time. I do, however, agree that there is a need to enter into bilateral discussions with Quebec.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** We have given those indications. There has been agreement between Quebec and Ontario to meet, first of all, at the deputies level. Following that meeting, I would be pleased to report to the House, if it is necessary, on when I would be meeting with my direct counterpart in Quebec.

**Mr Grandmaître:** We need action now, not next fall. We need action now. We need to protect jobs now

in the province of Ontario. People are losing their jobs every day. We need to protect these people. You rightly pointed out that the RMOC, the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, and la Communauté urbaine de l'Outaouais have been working very closely and have identified at least 50 existing barriers that could be resolved with possibly one or two, maybe three meetings of you and your Quebec counterpart.

**1510**

Madam Minister, I can't point out more. You have to meet with the Quebec people and the Ontario unions, the syndicates.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I just said a meeting has been arranged.

**Mr Grandmaître:** Well, you're shaking your head. I think you should meet with these people and find out what their problems are. You have a letter on your desk from the Ottawa-Carleton building association telling you that last April it were backing you on negotiations, but now it's asking you to take serious steps, to put an end, to put a stop to the interprovincial barriers.

What will you be doing within the next 10 days?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The reason I shake my head at the member is that I don't think he listened to the answer. In fact, I have already attended a meeting with the Quebec minister with respect to interprovincial trade in which these issues were raised, which led to an agreement that we would enter into bilateral discussions, and a meeting is being arranged for the appropriate deputies to meet on that issue.

I would ask the member opposite what action he is looking for. Should the province of Ontario erect unilateral retaliatory actions or barriers at this point in time when we are a signatory to an agreement not to create new barriers? I'm sure he would say no. Would he like us to take action irrespective of what's going on with the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, which he referred to, which has said very clearly they do not favour retaliatory action being taken by the province of Ontario till they complete their negotiations and their process, which they see completing in October?

We are working on this issue. We are not pleased with the position the province of Quebec has taken. We respect the desire of all provinces to bring down trade barriers. Ontario is an open province. We are entering into bilateral discussions to try and resolve these issues and try to persuade the province of Quebec to change its practices. Those meetings have been scheduled and are taking place. We are in fact taking action.

**LIBEL AND SLANDER LAWS**

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** My question is for the Attorney General. Ontario's libel and slander laws are antiquated and in desperate need of reform. Your predecessor chose not to address this problem and



stated that there will be no action to reform this area as long as this government is sitting. Do you support this position?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** There are many areas of work that are going on in the ministry at the present time, and it's necessary for us to set priorities around some of those areas.

When I talk about "those areas," I'm talking about the massive job of court reform that's ongoing, the kinds of work we need to do to address the issues of victims within the court system, the efforts that must be made to bring accountability into the system, the kinds of efforts we need to do to ensure equity for all the equity-seeking groups in the province.

We have had to set priorities. This is not one of the priorities that the government has set for the current term. That does not mean we are not concerned about many of the issues the member raises, but it does mean that, as any government in a sense of working in an orderly fashion must do, we have set priorities, and at the present time this is not a priority for this particular term of office.

**Mr Harnick:** This is one area in which the government could do something and it wouldn't cost any money. Unfortunately, only the rich can make use of the current libel laws. Can you explain why you refuse to reform this legislation? Why will you not make this law workable for someone who finds himself involved as a defendant in a libel action?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** There is no question but that this issue is very important to those who are involved in this kind of case, but anyone who watches this Legislature understands why it is difficult for this government to move forward with legislation, given the kind of obstructive tactics we see both opposition parties doing every day. If you look at the priority legislation we are attempting to get through this session, then it is very clear to us that we do not intend to be diverted from our major priorities. It would suit the opposition very well to try and divert this government from the very important legislative reform and change we must make, and we simply are not going to allow ourselves to be diverted. We are going to use the time in this Legislature to bring forward the legislation that we, as a government which has a right to govern, have decided is the priority.

#### LONDON OFFICIAL PLAN

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There's been a great deal of concern regarding development proposals in the newly annexed areas of the city of London and the requirement for a new official plan for the municipality. Regulations to guide London's new official plan were promised under Bill 75. What progress has been made by the city in developing a work program for a new official plan?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I'd like to commend the work and commitment of the member for Middlesex in representing the concerns of her constituents. Indeed, even early this morning she joined me in a meeting with Warden Joel Blackmore, and we had a very productive meeting in her riding. She has met with my staff on several occasions and with myself, and she has certainly forwarded the concerns of her constituents to this government.

Questions raised by her constituents about the official plan process for the city of London have been brought by that member to our attention, as well as individual development proposals. I'd like to assure her of my commitment and the commitment of this government to respond promptly to all requests for information. The city of London has commenced the process of planning review and consultation for a new official plan as mandated in the London-Middlesex Act, and the city is working closely with the provincial ministries, through the provincial advisory committee, to ensure that provincial interests are addressed.

**Mrs Mathyssen:** Thank you, Minister. I understand the difficulties. However, the people of London and Middlesex county would like to know when these regulations for a new official plan will be introduced.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The London-Middlesex Act does include provisions for the issuance of regulations concerning the development of an official plan. Staff in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs are currently reviewing the process initiated by the London council, titled Vision '96, which encompasses a broad review of strategic, social and economic planning as well as more traditional official plan elements, and I expect shortly to be able to respond further to the member's questions on the issuance of further regulations.

#### CLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICE

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** My question today is for the Minister of Transportation. I know you are aware of the impending decision to close down your ministry's district office in Port Hope, because I spoke to you about it last week. What it seems you are not aware of are the actual costs of this decision.

In your haphazard attempts at fiscal management, you have failed to consult with the front-line workers. Had you done this, you would have found out that hundreds of thousands of dollars could have been saved without this unnecessary closure. In fact, Port Hope staff suggested to your ministry official that over half a million dollars could be saved in combining operating costs and salaries. Your officials ignored this, said it was too late for these kinds of proposals. I didn't think any minister would ignore half a million dollars in savings.

Mr Minister, consider this: The retrofit for making the field operations telecommunication system compat-

ible with that in Bancroft would cost \$700,000, while the relocation of 40 to 50 employees would cost a minimum of \$1 million—that is, if there's any place for them to go, as the 40-kilometre restriction of your government's redeployment plan would appear to exclude them. Add to this the increases in travel, meals and accommodation expenses which will be incurred with the move from Port Hope to Bancroft.

I have prepared an information package for you full of the real, actual facts. Will you consider these facts before it is too late and the district office is moved? Will you give to me and the people at Port Hope the commitment today?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** I'd like the member opposite to consider this: The member will be aware that first and foremost we must address the human dimension, which is the people working at the Ministry of Transportation.

1520

Having said this, the member will also be aware that at present we have a workforce at Transportation which numbers 9,700 employees. The member should also be aware that in the next two years, because of the length of tenure, seniority at Transportation, more than 700 people will be eligible to reach factor 90.

The member knows that with the human dimension being catalytic, that I will, as a minister, make sure that on the one hand, we shall enact savings by cutting down the number of positions, yet, not so ironically, on the other hand, you will preserve the number of jobs but there will be fewer positions because people will be retiring anyway. Everything will be done to minimize the impact on people who already have a job, and everything will be done to maximize the impact on saving money for people who will not be replaced anyway.

**Mrs Fawcett:** The honourable minister puts me in mind of Marcel Marceau: Everything is in make believe.

Minister, you consider this: According to the growth rate figures as supplied by Statscan for the period of 1986-91, you will see that Northumberland county's growth rate was 15.5%, more than twice that of Hastings county and 50% more than the provincial average. Further, the service areas of Port Hope office, which includes most of Peterborough county, grew 18.9% to 24%, whereas those in Bancroft only grew at 2%.

These are significant differences and clearly indicate the future requirements for infrastructure development, maintenance and services that will be in the existing Port Hope district office area. It makes absolutely no sense to shut down an operation along the Highway 401 corridor that has the largest potential for growth and relocate to an area that doesn't have any potential for growth.

I know I don't sit at the same table that you and the

Minister of Agriculture and Food do, but surely you wouldn't disregard all of these facts for purely political reasons.

Will you review these facts? Will you review the fact that millions of dollars will be lost to the Port Hope and Northumberland economy? And if you are really going to go through with this crazy notion, would you even consider a contingency fund, then, to assist those affected by the decision?

We do not want the move, because it is not the one to make.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the member complete her question, please.

**Mrs Fawcett:** Move Bancroft down to us.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** To be compared to Marcel Marceau is indeed an honour. If it weren't for the employees, if the focus were solely on the question, Marceau would have dismissed it, à la bagatelle, with a gesture. Marceau doesn't speak, and yet he speaks legend. The problem here is that the member doesn't listen, Marceau or no Marceau.

People's jobs are at stake. We will do everything to redeploy. We have paid meticulous attention. No stone has been left unturned when it's time to talk about training, about alternatives, about redeployment, not only in the Ministry of Transportation but in working with other ministries.

By way of conclusion, we are fortunate at Transportation that the impact will be minimal. We will achieve substantial savings and people will be able to keep working for the government of Ontario in the great majority of cases.

## PETITIONS

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** I have a petition which I'd like to present today that has been given to me by many of the union members in the Quinte area. It reads:

"To the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the following undersigned citizens of the Quinte area, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"The Ontario government must immediately reset its course to build an Ontario society which is fair and just, protecting those who are most vulnerable within it and not scapegoat public sector workers in times of economic difficulty.

"Further, the government must respect these fundamental principles: free collective bargaining, a strong public sector and the strengthening of public services."

### NATIVE HUNTING AND FISHING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas in 1923, seven Ontario bands signed the



Williams Treaty, which guaranteed that native peoples would fish and hunt according to provincial and federal conservation laws like everyone else; and

"Whereas the bands were paid the 1993 equivalent of \$20 million; and

"Whereas that treaty was upheld by Ontario's highest court last year; and

"Whereas Bob Rae is not enforcing existing laws which prohibit native peoples from hunting and fishing out of season; and

"Whereas this will put at risk an already pressured part of Ontario's natural environment;

"We, the undersigned, adamantly demand that the government honour the principles of fish and wildlife conservation, to respect our native and non-native ancestors and to respect the Williams Treaty."

That's signed by 192 people from North Bay, Redbridge, Owen Sound, Meaford, Callander, Sturgeon Falls, Brantford, Minden, Haliburton, Peterborough and Bobcaygeon. I've signed it too.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have here a petition signed by many, many students in my riding, many hundreds of whom have signed this petition, concerned about their future and the future of their families and their children.

"Whereas we feel that the Canada-US free trade deal has done immeasurable damage to the economy of the province of Ontario, causing the loss of more than 45,000 jobs in Ontario alone; and

"Whereas we feel that the proposed North American free trade arrangement will have an even more devastating effect upon Ontario, resulting in a loss not only of jobs but also a reduction in environmental standards, our labour standards, our social standards, workers' rights and our overall quality of life;

"We petition the Legislature of Ontario in Toronto to fight this trade deal with whatever means possible and we petition the House of Commons to stop this deal now."

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I have a petition signed by some 60 residents of my riding and of the Ottawa-Carleton area. The petition reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'm going to read into the record again a number of things that people from across the province have presented against casino gambling:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I'm glad to affix my signature to this petition.

#### 1530

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I stand tall in my place to read a petition from the Stittsville United Church:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, members of the

Stittsville United Church, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

As I have stood tall in my place, I sign this petition.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** I didn't know the member for Carleton had reached such heights.

#### WASTE DISPOSAL

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** I have a petition signed by a full third of the residents who live in the town of Pickering.

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** All of them against casinos.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** And dumps.

**Mr Wiseman:** And dumps.

"We, the citizens of the town of Pickering, want the government of Ontario to know that we do not endorse the indiscriminate selection of another dump in our community. Specifically, we object to a selection process which chooses prime farm land close to residential communities on sensitive aquifers as suitable sites for landfill.

"We urge the government to be more environmentally responsible and do what is morally and legally right. We expect this from our elected officials.

"We are concerned that the ultimate aim of this process is to find a Metro Toronto landfill site, and not as we are led to believe, a Durham-only site. This belief is founded on the fact that none of the 57 sites is within Metro's boundaries. Political accountability can only occur if the site is located within the municipality it serves."

I affix my signature to this petition.

#### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** "We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"When discussing the future of Bruce A, to consider that the undersigned are in full support of the continued operation of all the units at Bruce A. Furthermore, we support the expenditure of the required money to rehabilitate the Bruce A units for the following reasons:

"In comparison to other forms of generation, nuclear energy is environmentally safe and cost-effective. Rehabilitating Bruce A units is expected to achieve \$2 billion in savings to the corporation over the station's lifetime. This power is needed for the province's future prosperity.

"A partial or complete closure of Bruce A will have severe negative impacts on the affected workers and will seriously undermine the economy of the surrounding communities and the province."

While I won't read all of the organizations supporting this petition, it is part of a petition that has gathered well over 15,000 names. It has my full support. I have attached my signature to this part of the petition.

I'd like to confirm that in fact Bruce A has received a certificate to continue operation for the following year.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it reads as follows—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** It's a good job you're in the back row.

**Mr Arnott:** I'll always be here.

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling (Macdonald and Macdonald, Pathological Gambling: The Problem, Treatment and Outcome, Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling); and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and



"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

The first name on the list is Doreen Quirk, councillor from Thornhill, and the other signatures were collected at Thornhill United Church—approximately 50 signatures presented. I'm very pleased to affix my signature to this petition and humbly present it with the hope that it does some good on this government.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, signed by a number of my constituents, including Eleanor Rice and Peggy Strong:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and" among other whereases

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I have affixed my signature.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education proposes to substantially modify the provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled by their downsizing, closing parts of or restructuring the schools, resulting in significant hardship for students, families, employees and the local community for the purposes of saving money; and

"Whereas the Sir James Whitney Parents' Association believes that the quality education delivered today within the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled provides the lowest total cost option available while allowing deaf students to wholly develop within their own culture and to receive the best education possible;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"(1) Maintain the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled until an acceptable model

from all interested parties has been developed; and

"(2) Empower local boards of trustees, as set out in model 5, to manage their own budgets within the ministry guidelines and funding."

I will sign my name. This is signed by a significant number of people who aren't in my riding.

#### CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food has decided to close Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the veterinary services diagnostic laboratory at the college as of May 1, 1994,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To reverse the decision to close the Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the veterinary services laboratory located on Centralia's campus."

I have signed the petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** Mr Speaker, I'd like to thank you very much indeed for this opportunity. I really appreciate the opportunity. I now know this really is an old boys' club.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, signifying our opposition to the intent of the government to legalize casino gambling in our province.

"We concur with the reasons expressed in the letter of the Interfaith Social Assistance Reform Coalition, which was written on May 3, 1992."

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Just for the benefit of members, when comes the time to rise for a petition, the Speaker always recognizes the person who rises first. If you stand up, how can I recognize you? You have to sit, rise and I recognize you. It's not being unfair. I recognize the first person who stands up, and that is the ruling. That is 22(b), for the benefit of the members.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr Paul R. Johnson from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill, as amended:

Bill 164, An Act to amend the Insurance Act and certain other Acts in respect of Automobile Insurance and other Insurance Matters \ Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances et certaines autres lois en ce qui concerne l'assurance-automobile et d'autres questions d'assurance.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall

the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1542 to 1612.

**The Deputy Speaker:** "Pursuant to standing order 27(g), I request that the vote on the motion for adoption of the report of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, Bill 164, An Act to amend the Insurance Act, be deferred until after routine proceedings, June 22, 1993.

"Chief Liberal whip, Steve Mahoney."

The vote will be accordingly deferred. Are there any other committee reports?

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Mississauga South, do you have a point of order?

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I guess not.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### KIRBRYN HOLDINGS INC ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Sorbara, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr9, An Act to revive Kirbryn Holdings Inc.

##### PARAGON FINANCIAL CORP ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Grandmaître, the following bill was introduced for first reading:

Bill Pr54, An Act to revive Paragon Financial Corp.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour that the bill pass will say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion is lost.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I move that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled An Act respecting Aphasia Centre—North York, and that it be now read for the first time.

**The Deputy Speaker:** That's not the right document.

##### PHILMANSEY INVESTMENTS LTD, 1993

On motion by Mr Grandmaître, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr55, An Act to revive Philmanser Investments Ltd.

##### VILLAGE OF MERRICKVILLE ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Runciman, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the Village of Merrickville.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could I perhaps seek unanimous consent of the House to let the member for Ottawa East try it again?

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Agreed, but before I recognize Mr Grandmaître, I would like to bring again the bill of Mr Turnbull.

##### APHASIA CENTRE—NORTH YORK ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Turnbull, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Aphasia Centre—North York.

##### PARAGON FINANCIAL CORP ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Grandmaître, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr54, An Act to revive Paragon Financial Corp.  
1620

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The member for Essex-Kent had finished his speech and we had reached a stage of questions and comments. Are there any questions or comments? Are there any other members who wish to participate in this debate?

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** I'm delighted to participate in the debate on Bill 48, the so-called social contract legislation. The reason I call it the so-called social contract legislation is that I'm not really sure exactly what the government means by its social contract.

It seems to me that when the "social contract" term was first introduced in the 1700s, it was a term that really was all-encompassing, where everybody who was going to be affected by the particular decision got together and decided in a collegial way what the outcome was going to be.

In this situation we have what in fact is a unilateral social contract. The government has called people together and said: "This is what we are doing to you. Now you tell us what you think would be the best way for us to do it to you." It is not asking them: "Is this



something that we should be doing? Do you have any other alternatives of what we should be doing?" It really is unilateral: "This is what we are doing. This is what we have to achieve. You tell us how we can do it. If you don't tell us, and if you don't come to a reasonable, in our opinion, solution, we will impose on you what it is that we think it should be."

I want to spend a bit of time talking about how we got to this point. How did we get to the situation where the government has had to take what many consider to be quite draconian means to rectify a problem that in many cases was its own doing?

I want to refer to the 1991 budget. The budget document, which was released by the Treasurer of the day, who still happens to be the Minister of Finance, is quite interesting to read when you read it in hindsight.

It starts off and says, among other things, that 1991 "is proving to be the most severe Ontario has experienced in the last 50 years. This recession is unlike economic cycles of the past. It is more serious because of the economic restructuring that is altering many traditional assumptions about the nature of growth and competition."

The government can't say, "We have suddenly been confronted with an economic situation that we didn't anticipate, that has created far more problems than we thought it was going to do and, as a result, we've had to take these somewhat stern measures."

Interestingly enough, on the same page the Treasurer says: "To support our economic strategy, we are committed to managing the public sector in ways that help meet our social and economic priorities through effective fiscal management."

That is a statement that we could have heard from this government today or in the last budget. They wanted to deal with the public sector in ways that help meet their social and economic priorities. But what actually happened? They didn't address that. They went about a totally different strategy.

I want to quote the next page. It says: "The Ontario economy has been in recession for a year. Job losses to date have already surpassed the levels in every recession since the Second World War. Since last spring, employment in Ontario has declined by about a quarter of a million jobs."

This was in 1991. Interestingly enough, and I think this statement is quite historic in its context, it says: "The unemployment rate, however, is only expected to decline to 7.8% by 1994. The jobless outlook is unacceptable to this government and we are committed to pursuing policies to fight unemployment."

What has in fact happened? In 1991, they had predicted that in 1994 they would be reduced to 7.8% unemployment, which was totally unacceptable. In the 1993 budget, it says the unemployment rate is not

expected to fall below 9% until 1996. In 1991, they thought it was going to be 7.4% in 1994. Now they're saying it's not going to be below 9% until 1996. What do we have? We have an effective unemployment rate in Ontario that is close to 14%.

I now would like to talk about what they said about the deficit, and this deficit is something that has captured the attention of everybody, certainly, in Ontario and in Canada. It says on page 3 of the 1991 budget, "The Government is convinced that allowing the deficit to rise to this level this year is not only justifiable, it is the most responsible choice we could make...." In 1991 they were out, I remember vividly, at the post-budget hearings, government members defending the fact that the deficit increase was a good thing. He goes on to say, "I think it's important for people to understand that we had a choice to make this year—to fight the deficit or fight the recession. We are proud to be fighting the recession."

There is an interesting statistic in the 1991 document. I'd like to bring all members' attention to it because I think it spells out why people do not have confidence in this government's ability to deal with this issue. I think there are very few people in Ontario who do not agree that there is a problem in the level of debt in this province and that the government has got to do something to address it.

I don't think anybody is opposed to that. I can tell you as a representative of our party that we are totally in agreement that something has to be done. Where we part and where we have a problem is that we don't think this particular piece of legislation and this government have the ability to do it. Why do I say that?

I think it's interesting to note that in a newspaper dated Thursday, June 17, which was last Thursday, there's a headline that says "Only The NDP Understands the Real World." That statement was uttered by Audrey McLaughlin, the leader of the federal NDP. That really goes to the heart of the problem.

The NDP has traditionally always felt that only it has the answer. It is only they who are in a position to decide what is right for any particular situation. The only problem we have is that the answers they had in opposition are totally opposite to the answers they have in government, yet on either side of the issue they were always right.

The real world is the real world, and the real world politically is that at the federal level the NDP is at 8%. They have one member elected in the last election in Nova Scotia. They got wiped out in Alberta. Their sole federal member in Quebec has announced that he will not be running and I predict that they will not elect another member in Quebec. In Ontario, as of May 26, the government was at 17%. If I can make a prediction, when the next poll comes out, I predict it will be lower.

What does this mean? It means that obviously they are not doing all of the things that they think are right, and on top of that they are obviously not dealing with the real world.

Let me get back to the 1991 budget. In this budget, the Treasurer projects what's going to happen over the next four years. This is in 1991. He says that the consolidated deficit, which is the operating deficit and the capital expenditure deficit, is going to be \$9.7 billion. Why did he pick \$9.7 billion? I will tell you very cynically, because it wasn't \$10 billion. The number had no relevance to anything other than it wasn't \$10 billion or higher. The idea was that for some reason there was a perception that if it went to over \$10 billion they would have a problem, whereas if it was \$9.7 billion it would be more acceptable and more palatable.

The government projected that its deficit would be \$9.7 billion. Their projection for the next year was that the deficit would be \$8.9 billion; that was for 1992-93. In 1993-94, they said it was going to be \$8.4 billion. The last year for which they made a projection was 1994-95, and they said it was going to be \$7.8 billion. The reason I outline those numbers is because any objective observer analysing those figures would know that we were going to be in big trouble, not because something was going to happen in the future; something had already happened.

1630

Let me give you an example of what the implications of those numbers mean. When the NDP came to power, the debt—and just so that listeners may clarify the difference, debt is accumulated deficit and deficit is the annual shortfall. The debt in 1990, when the NDP came to power, the accumulated debt since the beginning of this province, was \$42.3 billion.

In their first year, they projected, with this \$9.7-billion deficit, that they would take the debt to \$51.7 billion; in the second year, with their \$8.9-billion deficit, they were going to take it to \$60.6 billion; in the third year, with their \$8.4-billion deficit, they were going to take it to \$69 billion, and in the fourth year, with their \$7.8-billion deficit, they were going to take it to \$76.8 billion.

So in 1991, when this Treasurer and this committee were standing up and saying, "We believe in Keynesian economics; we believe that we are not prepared to fight the deficit; we're going to fight the recession," they had already made a commitment to run the debt, in four years, from \$42.3 billion to \$76.8 billion. Those are their figures.

If we take a look at the actual figures, because we all know that every one of Mr Laughren's spot-on predictions to date has been wrong, in year one, the deficit was \$10.9 billion, which took the debt to \$53.2 billion. In year two, it was \$11.9 billion, which took it to \$65.1

billion. Interestingly enough, the projections in the 1993 budget, including the savings that are going to be made because of this social contract, are still going to create a \$9.2-billion deficit in 1993-94 and a \$6.8-billion deficit in 1994-95, for a total of \$81 billion.

So what do we have? We have a government which, in the four years of its projections, has taken the debt of \$42.3 billion—that's if everything works well, and given its track record, I predict that the last two numbers will not be achieved—and is going to have an \$81-billion deficit. That's a best-case scenario; that is if they can finalize the social contract and if they can in fact achieve the numbers they want to achieve.

So what does that mean? It means they are going to effectively, during their term of office in that four-year period, with these very severe cutbacks in government programs, in public service wages, and increasing taxes, take the deficit and they're going to double it.

The question is, how did we get to this situation? As a member of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs I try to get the attention of the Minister of Finance. One of the major problems we have is that the documents that are presented to us and the decisions that are being made on the finances of Ontario are made for political optical reasons. They are not matters of fiscal responsibility; they are matters of politics. So what we have is a number that is always just short of some invisible barrier that if we go above it, we're going to be in trouble.

So you get a \$9.7-billion deficit, but how do you get that? You get that quite simply. You don't pay the teachers' money that you should pay; you pay them interest instead. You put in as a receivable money from the federal government that the federal government hasn't even acknowledged it's going to pay you. You do that so you can show a \$9.7-billion deficit. The following year, when you find that some of those things didn't work, well, people forget about that. It's really quite interesting the way the spin is put on this particular issue.

I remember when this government brought down its first budget of \$9.7 billion. There were demonstrations in front of Queen's Park. It precipitated a committee tour of the province to listen to people who were going to comment on this government's budget. I happened to get out some of the clippings of the reporting of that particular committee. To hear the government members talk about it, it was a resounding success and group after group after group that appeared before that committee praised the government for its stand to fight the recession and not to fight the deficit. The government came out with a report saying that there was virtually unanimous consent that this was the right move to make.

Then you ask the question, if that was the right move to make in 1991 when all of the facts were in front of



all of us—we knew that the economy was not performing in a way that would generate the kind of economic activity, resources and revenues that we'd expected; we knew that things were going from bad to worse—and this government chose to take a path of action that has led to and compounded the problem we are now facing, the question is, what could they have done about it? Well, they could have done lots of things and they still haven't done it. They are still playing around the fringes. They are saying things that, again, any objective observer looking at could only surmise make no sense.

I was reading some clippings today about the Premier and his comments. He was talking about: "We don't expect to have double jeopardy. If you've already made your cuts, we're going to acknowledge that and we won't allow you to have any more cuts. If you meet our deadline of August 1 or August 10, we'll give you another 20% discount." It's like a sale. "We'll do all of these things."

Somewhere along the line there is a bottom line: \$2 billion. Does that mean that some people are going to be penalized more than others? Does it mean that it's going to be who can get to whom first and who you know in terms of what happens as a result of this particular exercise?

More importantly, is this so-called social contract going to make a difference? I have said and I have given you some figures stating that with the social contract, with the so-called savings that the government is promising, they will still find themselves with a significantly higher debt at the end of their term than they themselves had projected in 1991 without the social contract. It's still going to be about \$5 billion more, and that is going on the assumption that they are going to meet their targets.

Let's talk about the targets. I have predicted every year, and you can check Hansard, that the government will not meet its targets, and I predict again that the government will not meet its targets. Why? Because the government in its wisdom uses the budget as a political document. I am cynical enough to know that every government does that, but what happens is this. In order to make the figures work—and what I mean by working is getting those figures to a point that they think they can sell—they have to adjust those figures. How do they adjust it? They make predictions as to the growth of the economy and what their expected revenues are going to be.

Every year they say: "Our revenues did not achieve our targets and our expenditures exceeded our targets. As a result, the numbers that we had projected last year have not been met. It's unfortunate, but that's what has happened to the economy. It's something we have no control over." I respectfully submit that they absolutely have control, not over what happens out there, because I am the first to admit that control, but they do have

control on how they report it.

Now, when we were at committee, the government came in, and in its projections—and you have to understand, when they project what the gross domestic product of the province is going to be, that impinges on the tax revenues that they expect to get. So what they do is they come in and they say, "We think that in this fiscal period the economy is going to grow by close to 4%," and they use that number to make all of their other calculations.

1640

They say: "We're going to have so much revenue, because the economy is going to grow. We're going to have people paying more tax; we're going to have more sales tax; we're going to be having more corporate tax. It's going to be a very substantial, buoyant economy, relative to what it has been in the past."

The interesting thing about that projection is that every single independent economic analyst who appeared before our committee came up with a lower number, some of them as low as half, most of them in the 3% or slightly higher than 3% range. What that means is that that number was put into the equation just so that it could make the books look better.

It's also interesting to note that even the most buoyant projections of people like the Conference Board of Canada—and we had a lot of fun with the Conference Board of Canada during that first 1991 budget, because it was the only group that thought the NDP was on the right track, and everywhere we went, if colleagues who were on that committee with me will remember, it was always referred to as "the prestigious Conference Board of Canada projections" that this government was absolutely on the right track.

Without in any way taking away from the Conference Board, not only was the government not on the right track but everybody acknowledged that that was the wrong way to go, and even this government has acknowledged that it is the wrong way to go and it has since done a complete U-turn and is now preaching the gospel of financial restraint and downsizing and all of the other things that are going on.

The Conference Board of Canada this year in its projections, which were relatively modest, has just come out with a projection that said even its projection this year, which I had no great problem with, is too high and in fact the economy is not going to grow at the same level as it had projected. It's interesting to note that they were considerably—not considerably, but they were certainly below the government's own projection and more in line with those people who feel the economy is not going to grow to the same extent. So where are we? We're in a situation where people are concerned.

I'd like to quote another interesting comment from

the Treasurer in his 1991 budget. He talks about why he wants to do certain things. He says, "People who are paid fairly, who have a sense of economic security and who feel they are respected partners in the process of change are better able to make a contribution to that process."

Now, if there was ever a statement that speaks absolutely contrary to the environment that we are in today—I mean, who in their wildest imagination would have ever thought that organized labour, those people who traditionally support the NDP, those people who look upon the NDP as being their party, would be out picketing in Gananoque, deciding what it is that they're going to do, claiming that there is for ever a rift between this government and the labour movement?

Yet this government in its budget put out a statement that I don't think anybody could object to. "People who are paid fairly, who have a sense of economic security and who feel they are respected partners in the process of change, are better able to make a contribution to that process." What we have now, that is not happening.

There's another statement that the Treasurer makes and again it goes to the same problem. He says, "We believe that workers will accept and support economic change if they can be sure that their statutory rights will be protected."

Again, there is a statement that should be enlarged, should be distributed and should be hung on the wall for all to see. We believe that workers will accept and support economic change if they can be sure that their statutory rights will be protected.

What do we have in this bill? We have a provision that if the targets set out in the so-called social contract are not met, the government reserves unto itself the right to make whatever changes to any statutory right of those workers it deems to be adequate to meet its target.

This, of course, goes to the heart of labour-management relationships in this province, and as a member who has been in this House for a reasonable amount of time, I can recall when the present government was in opposition and I can recall its championing of exactly the kind of things that it is now totally disregarding. That is why we have a problem.

Again, I want to make it absolutely clear and I want to make sure that everyone understands, there isn't anyone in this House—and I can say that advisedly—who objects to getting the cost of government under control. Nobody. We all understand that it's a problem. These are different times, these are times of constraint, these are times when we have to come up with a new order.

But what has happened is that we have a government that rather than identifying this problem in 1991, when it was there—and they can't use the excuse, "Well, we didn't know about it," because if you take a look at this

document, you will see that they knew the problem was there. If they had sat down with their partners in the private sector, the public sector, the expanded public sector and said, "We have a serious problem. Now, let's take a look at how we can resolve it, and that may mean taking some very drastic steps in the way we do business"—everybody, if you want to have a true social contract, should have been able to participate, and then say, "You know, we've got to take a look at a totally different way of representing the people and providing government and here's how we're going to do it, so that people will be able to afford to live in dignity, to maintain their houses, to educate their children and to have a quality of life that I think most of us have taken for granted."

Instead, we have a situation where there is turmoil, there is uncertainty and there is a despair—I use that word advisedly—that is permeating the climate in Ontario where we don't know where we're going, we don't know what is going to happen to us. For the first time, certainly since the post-Second World War period, parents are despairing for their children. Whereas we have always had a legacy where all parents felt their children was going to have a better life than they had, we now have a situation where parents are despairing that in fact their children will not even come close to the kind of lifestyle that they have been enjoying.

1650

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I would say that this is the most troubling debate that I've participated in in this Legislature. It's one where it's very easy to lapse into partisan rhetoric, and no doubt from time to time I and other members will. But it's important to start out by reflecting on the seriousness of the situation we have in this province, a situation that has, according to the government's own budget that it brought in—I'd like to read it in: "Excluding sovereign countries, Ontario has become the largest borrower in the world. On average we borrow more than \$1 billion a month. We spend more on interest costs than we spend on our schools. About two thirds of our new borrowing comes from outside Canada"—two thirds of the borrowing. In other words, we must have the confidence of the international community, and unfortunately we have lost that.

We know that a large amount of the bonds which this government floated early this year is still in the hands of those organizations that sell those bonds. They have no appetite for taking any further bonds, and the result of this will be that the government's ability to roll over debt as it comes due will be severely constrained.

I'd like to just go back and consider the history as to how we got into this situation. I think it would be fair to say that we should say it is not just the NDP that is the author of this bill, but rather David Peterson, Bob Nixon and Lyn McLeod, who had completely profligate spending in the years they were in office. This is the Liberal legacy.



The Liberal government, during an economic boom, increased expenditures at double the annual rate of inflation and paid for this spending binge with 33 tax hikes and a 30% increase in provincial debt; in other words, \$10 billion, a pretty sobering thought. Under the Liberals, the size of the Ontario public service grew from 80,142 in March 1985 to 88,265 in March 1990, and the public service payroll cost, which was wages and benefits, jumped by 60%, from \$2.7 billion to \$4.4 billion during the Liberals' time in office.

No wonder we have a problem. You cannot continue to spend more than you take in. Everybody who has a household knows this fact. Everybody who runs a small business knows this fact. Governments of every political stripe have got to come to terms with this reality.

What did the Liberals do during this time? They increased the taxes 33 times, as well as increasing the revenue which was coming in because of the booming economy. Yet notwithstanding this record revenue that we had and these increases in taxes, they still added \$10 billion to the debt.

This is the problem the NDP inherited, and the NDP had fought an election, according to its own paper, the Agenda for People, which recognized that there was a serious economic crisis that we were going into. I don't think, in fairness to the NDP, that anybody could have anticipated quite as serious a downturn as we have. But nevertheless, the way the government decided to fight this downturn was by trying to spend its way out of the problem, and it just simply didn't work.

The PC Party, from the very beginning, has advocated that there must be more sense of responsibility. My own leader, Mike Harris, in 1988 in a pre-budget report—this was during the Liberals' time in office—proposed that debt reduction and expenditure control become the primary focus of provincial fiscal policy, that the government develop a midterm fiscal plan to balance the budget, that sunset provisions be attached to all direct and tax expenditure programs and that any in-year revenue windfalls be dedicated to debt reduction.

This is something the Liberal government absolutely ignored when it was in office, because it had many windfalls. Let's just talk about one of those windfalls. The one year they managed to show a surplus that they're so proud of—let's examine the history of that. They had budgeted a \$90-million deficit. They got an unusual infusion from the federal government of unanticipated taxes because the economy was so hot and they got \$888 million as an unusual transfer that year.

Let's remember that they had budgeted a 90—I beg your pardon; they had budgeted \$550 million; I would like to correct it. They had budgeted a \$550-million deficit. They got an unusual amount of \$888 million given to them, yet notwithstanding that, they were only able to show a \$90-million surplus. What happened to

the extra money? Quite frankly, if they had not had that unusual, unanticipated amount of revenue, they would have had an even bigger deficit than that government predicted they were going to have.

Then they went to the polls in 1990, and this is where I got involved in politics because I was so disgusted with what the Liberal government was doing, and they came forward and told us they were going to have a surplus. Some surplus. The surplus turned into a \$3-billion deficit, and that's what the NDP started with. So while it's very easy to dump on the NDP for what it did, and I think they certainly reacted wrongly and I think with the advantage of hindsight I don't think they would react in the same way today, nevertheless, the so-called surplus turned into a \$3-billion deficit.

Our party recommended during the first budget consultations that we hold the spending to the increase in civil servants' wages to 2%. Instead, the government put through close to 6% by way of wage increases. On top of that 6%, there were merit increases and promotional increases. At the end of the year, what did we find the increase in government spending on wages? It was 14%. You cannot expect to balance the books when you know you already have a serious problem and you increase expenditures at that rate.

Those are the fundamental problems we're faced with. Now the troubling question is, what do we do about the situation that we find? There's no doubt about it, based upon the telephone calls I get from the general public. The general public says, "You must balance the budget by cutting back the amount of money you spend on government."

There isn't the capacity to raise taxes. We have seen the \$2-billion tax grab that has been put through in this year's budget which, I may say, the government has only allowed two days of debate on, notwithstanding the fact that we've consulted so broadly with all the public as to what they think of the budget. We've still been silenced. But that budget does not seriously come to terms with the debt reduction we have to get going with. The government has suggested that it will bring in a deficit this year under \$10 billion, and it just simply is not true.

Quite simply, if we turn, in the budget document, to the government's own numbers, we will find very quickly that in point of fact they have hidden \$1.6 billion. Where have they hidden it?

First of all, there is \$805 million they have taken off-book to crown corporations. That's not debt which has disappeared into the ether; it's still very much a debt that the province owes, but nevertheless they've shuffled it off the book. Maybe the electorate at large and maybe some unsophisticated investors ignore that, but I can assure you that the bond rating agencies will not ignore that \$805 million, nor will they ignore the \$600 million this government has changed. Instead of having transfers

for education purposes to the education authorities, they are now saying that instead of giving grants, they are going to have these school boards borrow \$600 million.  
1700

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm surprised to see that there is not a quorum present in the House on such a very vitally important debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please verify if we have a quorum? A quorum is not present.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mr Turnbull:** It's interesting to hear the Minister of Transportation coming in and saying that you have proportionately more members. Let me suggest to you, sir, that's at this time. In the future, it's very unlikely that you'll have any members in this House after the way you have run the economy of this province.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Turnbull:** I seem to have caught a raw note with the government. Let us return to the discourse about this bill. There can be no doubt that there is a concern among the general public—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Order.

**Mr Turnbull:** There can be no doubt that the general public has very little sympathy for the government which is spending at this rate of knots. We are taking the whole of the country down with the level of borrowing.

Let me just refer once again to the statement I quoted at the very beginning from the government's own budget of this year: "Excluding sovereign countries, Ontario has become the largest borrower in the world." That's an incredibly sobering statement and nobody, certainly not the Conservatives, will underestimate the seriousness of this.

We are intending to vote on second reading of this bill with the government, but we are going to put forward many amendments which we feel can address the very serious problems that we have with this bill. I'd just like to read into the record some of our concerns.

We are suggesting:

1. A three-year hiring freeze which has the potential to reduce the annual cost of the public sector compensation by over \$2 billion in the third year of this legislation.

2. A public sector wage freeze which would commence on the anniversary date of all contracts and continue for the three-year period from that date.

3. Whistle-blowing provisions to protect public servants who report fraud, waste or other abuses from

workplace retribution while netting substantial additional savings.

4. Provisions to discourage government departments from spending their budgets within the fiscal year, eliminating year-end burnoff, or face rollbacks.

5. Performance bonuses for public servants based on the efficiencies and productivity gains similar to private sector agreements, such as those involving the Canadian Auto Workers union.

6. Establishment of an expenditure review committee to identify non-productive government programs and prioritize existing programs.

We believe that if these amendments are accepted, the government can achieve a \$3-billion-per-year saving on a permanent basis. A permanent basis is very important, because let's examine what the impact of this legislation, as it stands, would leave us with.

There seems to be a reasonable expectation among the public service that at the end of the office of this government, in March 1996, there will be a catch-up in public sector wages, so the savings would go out of the window. Additionally, the concern is the fact that those people who are considered to be essential service workers, for example, those people who work in homes for the aged, where a staffing level is mandated, will have to take their 12 days off without pay during the time they would have their regular holidays. So the effect of this will be that pay for those back days will become due and payable on March 31, 1996, just coincidentally when the next government is likely to come in; 36 days will be owing. That's about a tenth, a good tenth of the year's budget.

By far the largest component of the government's budget is wages to the broader public sector, to its own civil servants and municipalities; by far the largest component is the cost of wages. So if we have one tenth of the wage bill coming due, and we know that the wage bill in the broader public service is \$43 billion, approximately \$4.3 billion will become due and payable in that time when this government leaves office.

This is not untypical of the way the government has been managing the economy. We have seen that in fact the government is now selling auto licences which expire well into the next government's mandate, and there's going to be a period of approximately two years when, other than new licences for people who've never held a driver's licence before, there will be no revenue whatsoever. That's approximately \$80 million a year in lost revenue.

So this government, rather than attacking the structural problems now—and it would find that it would get great support from us if it would do this—instead of doing that, it's pushing off these problems to a later government. What we say to you is: Do the correct thing now. Don't play a giant game that, quite frankly,



if you were to play it on an orange box on a street corner would probably land you in jail. Fix the problem now. You will have the support of the Conservative Party. If you don't fix it and if you don't address our amendments to this bill, I think you will find our support will be lacking.

We're putting it very fairly to the government. We're saying, yes, the basic concept of deficit reduction is something which we applaud and which we're prepared to work with them on, but unless you're prepared to do it on a permanent and fair basis, we will not address this.

There's no doubt about it that many of the areas of the public sector are going to be adversely affected by this bill, because they're applying just one yardstick to all aspects of the public service.

I'll give you an example. If we have a hospital which has provided very good management in the last two or three years and has got a lean and efficient operation, it will be subjected to the same degree of expenditure controls as those hospitals that haven't addressed their fundamental problems. If you already have an efficient operation, you cannot squeeze them any more, but this legislation just holus-bolus takes that approach and says: "We will reduce by this percentage. It doesn't matter how efficient you are." In other words, instead of rewarding those organizations that have already done the job for us, for the taxpayer, they are penalizing them, to the benefit of those organizations that haven't concentrated on expenditure reductions.

1710

The government should really, in fairness, rename this legislation. "Social contract" is not the appropriate name for it. It should be honestly portrayed as wage rollbacks because that's what it is. If you have 12 days off without pay, then indeed that is a wage rollback. It's opening contracts, and I don't care how the government twists and turns, that is what it's doing. I'm not saying that's wrong; I'm just simply saying they're not being totally honest with the public.

The suggestions that we would further make to improve the situation of this province are to enable Ontario to attract and retain job-creating investment and to exploit new market opportunities and to build a more entrepreneurial economy.

The PC Party has called for the repeal of the NDP's job-killing labour laws; a clear statement that wealth taxes will not be imposed in Ontario; a small business exemption from the EHT, the employer health tax; a competitiveness test for all new government taxes and regulations; the implementation of an aggressive policy of privatization; reform of the workers' compensation system; and linkage between welfare and skills training systems in the form of employer subsidies.

The PC Party believes that it is essential that the

government pursue policies which both upsize the private sector and downsize the public sector. In that context, Bill 48 is only a partial response to a much larger challenge.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** I would take this opportunity, the time given in this debate today with regard to Bill 48, to be able to go through some of the rationale of why the government decided to take the position that it did with regard to dealing with the expenditure control plan. But in order to do that, I think we first, in all fairness, need to look back to where we were two or three years ago, with regard to 1990, with regard to provincial expenditures of the day and where the economy of Ontario found itself.

I think most fairminded people would look back to 1990, September 6 to be exact—we were in the midst of going into one of the worst recessions this province had seen for the last 50 years. People on election day, September 6, went out and they elected a government, I think, not so much because they were voting for somebody as much as they were voting against the administration that was there at the time.

I say that without undue respect to the opposition. I just mention that because people knew that there was a recession coming on, people knew that there were some tough decisions that governments had to make, and I think what was in the minds of most voters was they were saying, "Who can best represent those views?" Basically, they decided to choose New Democrats on September 6.

Now, when we were elected, one of the things that obviously happened was that, as New Democrats, we sat down as a caucus and started to get a handle on where the provincial economy was at and where expenditures and where revenues were at with regard to the province of Ontario. You would remember that one of the big shocks that we had after being elected was that we found out there was a little bit less money in the coffers than what we were led to believe at the time.

We made a decision at the time. At the time, we said we were not going to criticize the Liberal government of the day because we didn't want to—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Did you read your campaign material?

**Mr Bisson:** If I can have the members in opposition just listen for one second, this is a compliment. We decided at the time, in 1990, that we weren't going to criticize the then Liberal government for that situation, because we recognized that the problems that were happening with regard to expenditures were not all the doings of the Liberal Party that happened to be government at that time.

What was happening in the economy was that their revenues were being affected because there were fewer and fewer people working, there was less tax coming in,

less expenditures by private individuals. They didn't have the revenue coming in, at the same time that their expenditures were going up with regard to social assistance, with regard to the help that people needed in order to be able to weather them through that particular recession. That is why the government found itself in 1990 in a position of having to make a very difficult decision about how much of a debt we felt at the time that the province can be able to deal with any particular time.

The government made a decision. The government said in 1990—in 1991, actually, in the budget—that we were going to undertake, in order to try to manage our debt, at somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$9 billion to \$10 billion, if you would recall, and that the long-term plan of the government would be that we would manage down that debt from about \$9 billion to \$10 billion over a period of years downwards, hopefully over the long term, to get back to where we were at the beginning, which was about a \$2-billion deficit at any one particular time.

Why did we decide to do that? It was a very simple reason. We decided to do that, rightfully so at the time, because we believed that at a time in the middle of a recession you couldn't come in and say, "Zap, we're taking \$9 billion out and we're not doing anything in order to protect people's lives and the services that they need in order to get them through the recession."

We got criticized, if you remember. We had protests out on the lawns at Queen's Park. We had our phones called in at our offices. We had fax machines around the province sending us all kinds of messages telling us that we couldn't run a debt at the time. But the government stood fast because we believed, like every responsible government before us, that you can't rule strictly by what's happening in regard to protests outside of Queen's Park, you must rule for the greater good of the people who you represent and who you're there to govern. So we decided at the time that we would run that deficit and try to manage it somewhere around the neighbourhood of \$9 billion to \$10 billion.

Over a two-year period, the government decided that what it would do is try to manage down its expenditures over a longer period of time in order to be able to reduce that debt, and we did so. If you take a look at the question of health care, the then Minister of Health and the now Minister of Health dealt with the question very directly in the Ministry of Health in order to reduce expenditures from what they were before. If you would remember, Mr Speaker, a mere two years ago health care costs in the province of Ontario, like every other province and like every other jurisdiction that has medicare the way we understand it, were going up 10% plus per year.

One of the reasons that was happening is, quite frankly, that there was no attempt on the part of any

government in the past to really deal with the question of managing health care for very real reasons, because once you decide to try to manage a system, it means to say that you've got to start saying no to certain things and you've got to start regimenting people about how they spend the public dollars.

One thing that we all understand as politicians, and I think people understand, is that it is very difficult for governments to stop doing something that was done in the past. People react badly to that and politically it is difficult for governments to deal with. Nevertheless, as a responsible government, we said we must undertake to manage our health care costs, so we did a number of things.

Hospitals were not allowed to run deficits the way they were in the past. They had to put together expenditure or control plans in order to manage down their budgets. I know at the Timmins District Hospital in my riding, they had a fairly substantial deficit that they had to deal with. What did the hospitals do? We said to the hospitals, through the Minister of Health and the ministry directly, "We want you to involve workers and bring them to table and we want you with the people at the table to find ways that you can find reductions in expenditures within your particular hospitals."

Was it an easy solution, Mr Speaker? Of course not. Both sides struggled for a long time, the workers and management, because they were not used to working in that kind of atmosphere because that was not just the way you did things in the past. I know at the Timmins District Hospital, the management and the board at the hospital along with the workers and their unions came together and tried to find some solutions.

They didn't get everything that they wanted in the end on either side but they found some very innovative solutions about how you can better manage the whole question of health care within a hospital setting. And guess what, Mr Speaker? They met their target. They met their target because they got together and they brought solutions jointly to the table, not just from one side.

We also looked at the question of expenditure reduction from a number of other points. We looked at how ministries spent dollars at the time and we said: "Do ministries have to do as much travelling as they're doing now in order to conduct their business? Do ministries have to have the level of expenses when it comes to the amount of things that we buy to keep our ministries going as we did in the past?"

We said, as responsible government, we need to be able to manage down the cost of these ministries, so we did so. Was it difficult? Of course it was difficult. We put together joint management boards with our workers through OPSEU and other unions in order to work at that, so that we can find better ways of managing our ministries.



Was it a perfect solution? No, there is never a perfect solution. I think most people would recognize that it's fairly difficult to try to change the way we did things for hundreds of years. When you start empowering workers to become part of a solution, there are people on both sides of that argument who have a difficulty being able to adjust to it. Nevertheless, we persevered and we went forward. We did so. We found ways of reducing costs to government in such a way that included workers in the solution and we managed greatly to reduce the total amount of expenditures within the provincial government. You would know that just in the last budget alone, for every dollar that we spent, we saved \$4 of new spending.

I think that people need to acknowledge the real effort that this government has had in order to be able to manage our expenditures, to manage our debt, and the way that we've done it in being able to involve workers.

1720

One of the difficulties through this whole process is that for the last two years there has been a great deal of uncertainty for the people of Ontario, as in very other jurisdiction, not because of what the government was doing or not doing; because of the sheer fact of what's happening in our economy. We have an economy that's much more mechanized than it was in the past. We need less workers. To produce the same goods that we did years ago with 100 workers, we can now do with 10, because of what was happening in regard to world trade, what was happening in regard to other jurisdictions coming on to the scene, producing things that they have never done before.

I can tell you, as the member for Cochrane South, 20 years ago we didn't have to compete with Chile when it came to mining. Today in 1993, you do, because Chile is now on the mining scene and that has affected how we do things in Canada. Competition is much more keen, and it means to say that a lot of companies don't have the dollars they used to have before. By virtue of having a lot more competition out there, it's a much smaller—

**Mr Sorbara:** Thank you, Brian Mulroney; thank you, Michael Wilson.

**Mr Bisson:** I would agree with the member opposite. It's a much more keenly competitive market out there that we need to deal with, and those companies had difficulty.

Obviously, another thing that greatly affected what happened—I think the member says correctly that there's a whole approach in regard to the federal government, one that comes to the question of free trade, the dismantling of the Foreign Investment Review Agency, the privatization of a number of crown corporations etc. We had a whole number of initiatives that came through the federal government as well that made

it very difficult for provinces across Canada to be able to deal with expanding their economies and making sure they had the revenue there to pay for the services. So over a period of time, I think we've seen a number of things happen in our economy that have really put us in a very difficult situation.

Here we are today, in 1993, and the problem is not any different than it was in 1990 in the sense that we still have the same problem in regard to how much money is coming in and how much money is going out. The difference is that it has really accelerated. If you were to look at it as a slope, you would see that's what happened in regard to revenues coming into the province in a number of different ways. One of them, coming from the federal transfer payments from our federal government, we've seen diminished by almost \$5 billion since I've been here. That has affected us. That's real. We can't run away from that.

I understand. This is not to totally criticize the federal government. They have their own problems to deal with. God behold the next federal government that takes over, either Liberal, New Democrat or Conservative, which has to deal with the problem that they have in Ottawa. I tell you we're going to be dealing with it in spades here in Ontario, because they have a \$35-billion problem that they have to deal with, and in the end we're going to have to be able to deal with that here in Ontario as well.

*Interjections*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Bisson:** If we can quiet down the members on the opposite side, we might be able to get on with this debate.

Anyway, as I was saying, basically where we are now in 1993 is being able to try to find a way of dealing with the expenditure problem and the debt problem that we have within the province of Ontario.

We've seen, like I've said, an erosion of our revenue because of a cut in the transfer payments of some \$5 billion in regard to our money coming in from the federal government. As well, we have to deal with the question of how much less money is coming in because less and less people are working. Because of the people who have lost their jobs in Ontario over the period of time because of the free trade agreement, we have less people paying into the provincial government.

At the same time all of that is happening, again we're having to deal with more people on social assistance, more people asking for health care coverage because of depression and different things that happen to people when they're not working.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the honourable members not to engage in interjections across the floor. The honourable member for Cochrane South has the

floor, and at this point he cannot be heard. I would ask the honourable members to please contain themselves.

**Mr Bisson:** As I was saying, we are here, in 1993, with the same problem, except that it's much more magnified. What we're seeing now is that a lot of the people who used to be on UIC a year ago are now falling on to social assistance in greater and greater numbers. It means to say that our costs and municipal costs are going up a heck of a lot higher on that side than most people are able to deal with in regard to their capacity of what their provincial treasuries are able to deal with, or municipal treasuries, and at the same time we're still having the problem on the expenditure side in regard to how much money is going out because of the drain that's happening on our treasury.

If the government was to do absolutely nothing, we'd find ourselves next year having to deal with a deficit of possibly some \$17 billion. I think most reasonable people would agree, and I don't hear anybody on the union side and I don't hear anybody on the other side saying that we don't need to deal with that very real problem. It comes down to a question of what you do. How do you deal with an economy that has lost so much money because of what's happened within the economy, with less people working at the same time as what's happened in regard to the expenditure side with people needing services?

**Mr Sorbara:** How about calling an election?

**Mr Bisson:** The Liberals called an election two and a half years into their term in order to duck this issue, Mr Sorbara. We're not going to take that approach. We have a responsibility to the people of Ontario, and we will do so.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Bisson:** Mr Speaker, he shows up here from time to time. If he would be here more often, we could take him a little bit more seriously.

Where we're at is, how do you deal with it? Basically, you have a couple of choices. One of the things you can do is that you can ignore the problem and allow the deficit and the debt to go to a point that at one point hopefully we'll be able to deal with them if things should turn around. I think most fairminded people would say that is not a very likely solution. That's not very likely what people think would be the right thing to do.

The other thing that you could do as well is that the government could do what other governments have done in regard to strictly just cutting expenditures, period, without a consideration of what it's going to mean for the services of the people they represent.

Rather, this government has decided to take a fair-minded approach, a difficult, I would agree, situation for people to be able to adjust to and to accept.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. I'd like to say that it is not very helpful to the honourable member for Cochrane South as he's trying to do his debate. I would ask the honourable members to please not interject. I would also say to those members who are not in their seats particularly not to interject.

**Mr Bisson:** As I was saying, there's a number of options that the government has at this particular point. The government can say, "We'll allow the debt to just keep on climbing, not be too conscious of it and hope that if things should turn around, the problem will fix itself." That's what the federal government in Ottawa did for eight years. It hasn't worked. Their debt has just kept on climbing and climbing and climbing, to the point that we need to deal with it.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bisson:** We're not going to get into that one, what happened prior to that. We're concerned about what's happening now.

The other thing that we can decide to do is that we can decide to indiscriminately go into programs and say, "We're just going to cut by X amount or percentage and never mind what happens." Rather, we decided to take a fairminded approach. I would accept the criticism that it's difficult for people to adjust to. I think that's fair. Nobody likes to see any kind of a program being affected downwards. Nobody likes to see anything that they work for over a period of time being lost. I accept that criticism. But I think most people understand why we need to do what we've got to do.

The approach we've done is quite simple. We've done three things. The first thing, on the expenditure reduction side, is that we've said, "Let's look at all of our ministries, let's take a look at how we spend dollars and are there better ways of managing our expenditures within ministries and in light of programs or how we service those programs or how we man our departments that could give us economies within those particular ministries?"

We've done that with an eye to making sure that we don't affect services downwards in a sense that people really feel it in regard to the services they need. I would put to most people that if you take a look at the services being offered today in Ontario to where they were two or three years ago, there's not a very big difference in how those services are being offered.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please, gentlemen.

**Mr Bisson:** I think it is quite fair to say that people are still able to access health care, people are still able to access education, people are still able to access all kinds of programs that are necessary in order to conduct their daily lives, and in a time of need, to be able to access services that they need in order to be able to



sustain themselves.

On the other hand, we've also said on the question of revenue that we can't control what happens on our transfer side in regard to the federal government, but what we can do is that we can take a look at what we do in regard to revenue—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I'd like to say to the House that this is not a place for debate across the floor when the honourable member is speaking in the House. It's not fair to the honourable member for Cochrane South. If you want to discuss things, by all means adjourn to the other chambers, but in this chamber the member for Cochrane South has the floor. I'd ask the honourable member to continue.

**Mr Bisson:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It's unfortunate. I was only going to take 10 minutes, and I'm up to 15 with all the interjections we've had up to this time.

As I was saying, the other thing we did on the second leg of the stool in terms of dealing with this problem is that we said: "We can look on the tax side. We can take a look at the revenue side." Yes, we moved on the taxation side; there's no question about that.

The debate we had within the caucus was, how do you do that in such a way that it's not just one sector of our economy that pays? We felt the most fairminded way of dealing with taxes is through the income tax. If we moved on retail sales tax or on traditional sin taxes, if we moved on some of those others, it would be much more difficult to deal with, but if you do it on the personal income tax side, at least it is a fairer way of approaching it.

1730

We also moved on the question of introducing for the first time in the province of Ontario a minimum corporate tax, maybe not as far as people wanted to go—or maybe too far, depending what side of the argument you are on—but basically saying that those who have the dollars should be paying their fair share of taxes. Also, on the surtax, we said if you make more money than the average person, you should be paying a little more.

But that wasn't enough to deal with the situation. If we wanted to keep our debt numbers at somewhere around \$9 billion to \$10 billion a year, which is still a substantial debt at the end of the day, we also had to look at the whole question of our wage bill in the province of Ontario. This brings us to this bill. If you take a look at the total expenditures of the province of Ontario, our total budget is some \$50 billion.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Bisson:** Of the \$50 billion we spend, \$44 billion goes to wages. That is paid either by us directly as the government to the Ontario public service or to the

public sector through hospitals or municipalities or school boards or through government agencies.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the honourable member for York Centre to please come to order.

**Mr Bisson:** Some \$44 billion of our total bill is wages. A lot of people in this Legislature have served on school boards. We know, for an example, that some 85% of the total bill of education goes to paying salaries. How much room do you have on the expenditure side if you start trimming the cost of programs but don't really affect people's wages? There's no magical way of doing this.

So we said we have a couple of choices. We can do what the Liberal government in Newfoundland did, which is basically to say, "I'll go to war with my civil service and I'll play politics during an election," to be quite blunt, and to say, "We're going to roll back your wages 5%" or 6% or 8%, whatever the decision was, "in order to get the savings," period. That was one way to deal with it. We could have done that, and maybe politically it would be a lot easier to do it that way, but we don't believe that as New Democrats.

We believe the best thing we can do is to try to get the players at the table, to try to get the partners at the table, to ask, "Is there a way to engage in a discussion to look at the how we pay our workers in the province of Ontario and how we can find savings?" rather than (a) laying people off or (b) just unilaterally rolling back wages.

No matter how you do this, it's going to be difficult. It's going to be difficult for all sides, because there are no magical solutions. I hear the Tory party across the floor and the Liberal Party across the floor, and even some media, with all kinds of simple solutions. Well, they know better. They were in government before and they know that this is a very difficult question to deal with. But I understand. That's the role of opposition, and we would do the same thing, to be quite blunt. I don't run away from that. No? Well, some of our members are saying no.

We asked, how can we do that by bringing people to the table? We proposed a social contract and we brought the stakeholders to the table and said to the unions, "For years in the trade union movement we've been saying that if you empower workers with the ability to help make decisions, they will be able to rise to the challenge and be able to come to the table and to help us to be able to solve problems that are very difficult in nature."

The unions took up that challenge and came to the table. They found it difficult. There was a number of reasons it was very difficult for them to deal with during negotiations, because there isn't a culture in Ontario that has ever allowed that to happen before. So

obviously some of the unions and some of the associations dealt badly with the proposal. There's no question about that. I don't think we in government believed that this would go smoothly and that there wouldn't be any problems along the way, because it's a very difficult question for people to deal with.

But they came to the table none the less and they did make some proposals. The body of those proposals can be found in government documents, in terms of what was being actually proposed, in the legislation we have before us today, which is the following: that rather than laying off workers indiscriminately, as is done in the private sector when it has a financial problem—normally the way it works in the private sector. I know; I've been affected. I've worked at Pamour mines. I remember in 1982, when the—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for York Centre will come to order.

**Mr Bisson:** —recession was going on and the revenue of my company went down to such an extent that it didn't have the money to pay the wage bill. My employer said: "The only way I know how to deal with this is to lay off X amount of workers who equal X amount of dollars. It doesn't matter. It's just the way we're going to do it."

I, as a union member, proposed to my company that we look at job sharing. We said: "Is it possible, if workers were to give up a day a week or a day a month or a day every two weeks, that we'd be able to pool those dollars together to save the jobs of some of our brothers and sisters? Are we able to look at some of the benefits we have in terms of holidays, floating holidays or whatever, that maybe we can put on hold for the time being until the price of gold turns around and we are in a better position to pay those things?"

We looked at those questions. In the end, unfortunately for me, my company chose not to do that. In a conversation I had with one of my personnel people at the time, they said, "Gilles, it is much easier to manage a layoff than it is to manage a social contract," for lack of terms, because once you do a layoff, that's the end of it, it's finished; the political damage is done. But if you try to negotiate a solution that empowers workers, you have to manage that problem of how you get people at the table and how you come to some of these solutions over the long term.

In other workplaces we've seen that approach happen. We've seen it in a number of workplaces within the Canadian Auto Workers. I know a number of plants within CAW have dealt with this question in the past, where workers have come to the table and said: "Rather than having layoffs, maybe we can take a look at job-sharing. Maybe we can look at some of our benefits etc." Workers chose to do that in order to save the jobs

of some of their brothers and sisters.

I know in my organization, the Steelworkers, it's been done, and I know it's been done in other unions across the province, across the country, for that matter. Algoma Steel in Sault Ste Marie recently reduced its wages by some 20%, basically, in order to save the jobs and to save that company from going under. Was it easy for them to do? Was it easy for Steelworker locals in Sault Ste Marie who worked for years to get those benefits and to get those wages for their members? Was it easy for them to deal with? Of course not. It was very difficult.

None the less, the workers came to the table and dealt with the challenge. With great difficulty, they came to a solution. In the end, they found a solution that was not totally palatable to everybody, neither to the company nor to the workers. None the less, it was a solution that, without the cooperation of the workers, could never have been found. I think we should salute the people in Sault Ste Marie and in Kapuskasing and in Thunder Bay and in other places across the province who have adopted those solutions.

**Interjection:** It saved jobs.

**Mr Bisson:** Exactly. It saved jobs.

What we're attempting to do within the civil service of Ontario and within the broader public sector in the province is that we're saying: Can we embody those principles in a social contract? Rather than dealing with the question of trying to manage our debt strictly by laying off workers, can we look at the question about days off, voluntary or legislated or whatever it might be? Can we take a look at the question of what happens in regard to merit increases? Can we take a look at what happens, quite frankly, in regard to pension contributions? Some of the unions are ready to deal with that and some of them are not.

**Mr Sorbara:** Name one union that supports this bill.

**Mr Bisson:** I will not engage in negotiations across the way with the member from wherever.

One of the big difficulties we have in this whole debate is the agitation with regard to misinformation going on out there by some of the members opposite.

Was it difficult for them to deal with? Of course it is. It's extremely difficult for trade unionists to deal with this question. Nevertheless, some of the workers are coming to the table, through their unions, and trying to find solutions.

It brings us to where we are now. At the end of the process of social contract negotiations, we couldn't come to a unanimous agreement. We had part of the way, part of the solutions, but we didn't have it all. So the difficulty we had as a government was, what do we do? We can decide to say, "The heck with it," just drop the whole thing by the way and hope to heck we could manage the layoffs with the least amount of pain



possible in the least difficult way.

We decided, no, that's not quite fair, because we know that some municipalities and some school boards and some hospitals and some agencies will not be able to deal with this quite well enough and a lot of people may end up losing their jobs with lack of leadership from the provincial government.

So we decided we would take the principles that we negotiated within the social contract and put them into legislation and then say to the workers out there and to the unions quite directly, "We encourage you to negotiate with your employers a solution that is mutually acceptable for both parties, but in the end, if you cannot get a solution, if you're not able to come to a decision between the two parties, here at least is something that will protect the greatest amount of workers possible."

Yes, it will reduce the amount of days that people are paid within a year. It'll reduce it by a maximum of 12 days. Yes, it will deal with other questions, of making sure that if I lose my job within, let's say, a hospital in Timmins and there's an opening in South Porcupine, I can at least get a job in that other hospital down the way, or in Iroquois Falls or in Matheson. If I end up losing a job altogether, I will get 95% of my wages for one year.

Is it difficult to deal with? Yes, it is, but I think workers will rise to the challenge, along with their unions, and will come to finding a solution to this very difficult problem.

I would say, just before closing, that much has been said about this whole debate, and one of the things that's to the advantage of the opposition parties is to see this whole process fail. I say directly to the members of the opposition, shame on you, not so much for criticizing, but for not accepting your role as opposition members of coming forward and trying to find ways of bringing workers to the table with their unions. You understand as well as I how difficult it is to get them there.

1740

I think one of the things that the former Minister of Labour especially could help us with is to try to find a way of keeping the debate on this thing focused on the issue, which is, how do we manage the cost of the public sector within Ontario and how can we get people to come to the table so that we can find some innovative solutions that I think the people of Ontario have charged us with: being able to find solutions that will least affect negatively the people within Ontario in regard to services or jobs?

I say shame on the opposition for stirring up the cauldron, and I'll say it very directly, in regard to trying to put as much confusion around this question as possible so that people are not able to deal with the facts of the issue.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I ask the honourable member for York Centre to please come to order.

**Mr Bisson:** I've had in the past three or four weeks a number of calls from constituents within the riding of Cochrane South who are quite concerned around this question. The one thing that strikes me is that once you talk to people and you explain to them what's being proposed, they're saying: "Well, that's not what I understood. That's not what I've been told. That's not what I heard Lyn McLeod saying. That's not what I heard Mike Harris saying. That's not what I heard"—in some cases—"my own union leader saying."

I think one of the things we're all responsible for in this Legislature is trying to get the information out to the people. Let's play politics with another issue, not this one. This is a very difficult one for workers to deal with, and I urge members to be able to help us in working through this whole process so that, in the end, workers will not have to revert to this particular bill but rather come up with negotiations in regard to finding a solution to this very difficult problem.

With that, I would end my particular session and my particular turn in debate and invite any comments.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments? The honourable member for York Centre.

**Mr Sorbara:** I'm going to be speaking shortly on this bill, but I simply note that my friend from Cochrane South preached a sermon which sounded like this bill is the great saviour of workers in the province of Ontario.

I defy him, I ask him in his response to put into the record of this House the name of one trade union leader in Ontario, simply one leader who supports and advocates passage of this bill, just one—I don't need five; I don't need six; I don't need 10—the president of a local union, any member of the broader public sector or the private sector union leaders who advocates that this bill ought to be passed. I'd like him to do that.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** I thought it would be a cold day in Hades when we'd sit in this House listening to ex-union brothers and sisters such as the one who just spoke and started lecturing us across the floor about not being responsible opposition parties because an NDP-socialist, labour union-oriented government decided to institute a piece of legislation that reopens 8,000 contracts and rolls back wages. I mean, have the tables turned?

This seems to me you could rationalize anything. It matters not what it is as a government or what principle you believe in. You just stood for half an hour and rationalized the most fundamental belief that you ever had in your life, and then you blamed us. You blamed us because you decided to rationalize away 8,000 collective agreements and a million contracts.

I think it would have been far better for this member,

rather than standing up and making a complete fool of himself and everything he has ever stood for, to quietly sit idly by and vote and accept his paycheque, because that's the payoff he got to support the legislation of Bill 48.

I'll tell you point-blank that I challenge this member to go out to the people in this province—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** This is a member from London who's doing the exact same thing, reopening 8,000 contracts and rolling back wages. You stood for everything that was separate—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The honourable member for Wentworth North will come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** —and different from that. London Centre.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** London South.

**Mr Stockwell:** London South.

If you want to stand in this House and rationalize away your every basic principle that ran through every fibre of your body, be my guest, but don't blame me because you sold out. I would never sell out my constituents in that fashion, and this caucus would never sell our constituents out like that. I say shame on you and stop lecturing me.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** First of all, I'd like to commend the member for Cochrane South for his refined remarks in dealing with a very sensitive subject area.

Listening to the member and then listening to some of the members who've responded, primarily the member for Etobicoke West, you wouldn't be able to tell that the member for Etobicoke West has essentially said, and I know for a fact that several of the members in this caucus have said that they're going to be supporting this legislation.

It makes you wonder where that kind of interest is coming from. I can only say that the role of opposition is sometimes to play the role of the opposition and to simply undermine, but I suspect that when it comes down to putting the chips down and laying down the bet, they'll be on the side of the government because they believe and they quite frankly feel that this legislation is appropriate, it's accurate, it's appropriate for the time and it deals, as the member for Cochrane South suggested, with a financial situation in the province of Ontario in a very serious and a very pragmatic way.

For members of the opposition to stand and essentially try to fearmonger and quite frankly distort the facts and try to distort the information, that's not appropriate. They'll take the example from the member for Cochrane South and present the facts as they are and try to debate

them in an intelligent, articulate way as opposed to just simply standing in their place and playing the role of the opposition.

**Mr Runciman:** I want to join my colleague from Etobicoke West in questioning the member for Cochrane South in respect to some of his comments.

I too have a great deal of difficulty with some of the positions being taken by the current NDP government, given the history of its stands in the past and certainly the strong connection with organized labour in this province. Many of the members on the government side certainly either worked within organized labour or held very senior positions in organized labour. So it is difficult indeed for us to swallow some of the rationalizations coming forward.

The member for Etobicoke West described your jobs as payoffs, and I don't know if I'd go quite that far. What I suggest, though, is when we look at a lot of principle going by the boards in respect to stands and positions that you and your party have believed and have stood for over the years, we have to wonder if the fact that going out into the bleak Ontario economy, if we call an election, if you defeat your own government, the likelihood is very strong that most of you are going to be out looking for work. It's a very difficult economy to face trying to find a job.

I think that really is the bottom line in respect to why most of you are doing what you are doing, going against what you've believed in for all of these many years.

We have great deal of difficulty with a lot of the components of this legislation. We think there are other ways this government could have done things in terms of curbing its spending appetite.

One of the matters raised in the House today was the non-profit housing program. We have a Minister of Housing who doesn't really have a clue what's going on in respect to that area of her responsibility. If the private sector were developing housing, we would not be faced with a situation whereby we continue to subsidize these individuals residing in these houses by an average of \$1,000 a month. They're not contributing to Ontario's society in any way, shape or form. Alternatives have been presented to her, alternatives have been presented to that government, and that's just one indication of where money is being thrown out the window with no concern for the bottom line in terms of total government expenditures.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Cochrane South has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Bisson:** I'd just try to respond very quickly. First of all, the Tories talk about not having a clue in regard to how to deal with this. I see the federal government had real good clues. They put us in this mess with regard to their federal policies, and we're now having to



deal with the mess, quite frankly. So we don't need a lecture from the Tories about the solutions that they have.

We know what they talked about. They talked about competitive tests in regard to taxes being introduced in the province of Ontario. Give me a break; as if you guys would even attempt that.

You talk about reforming the WCB. We know what reform means from a Tory. We really understand that. You talk about upsizing the private and downsizing the public sector. I think most people understand what that means. We understand that language quite well so don't come with that one.

1750

The other question is—I would only want to recommend to people that the other thing people have to say is, “You know, the New Democrats”—in regard to the question of dealing with large provincial budgets and all that—“don't have too much of an understanding and have not had to deal with this.”

I would remind you, social democratic governments in Saskatchewan under Tommy Douglas, and in Manitoba and British Columbia, were able to balance their budgets in all cases. All those government were

good, sound fiscal managers, because we understand the value of a buck. Why, Mr Speaker? Because it's most of our people who are paying that buck, not like those people across the way.

It took Tommy Douglas 17 years of good, sound fiscal management within the province of Saskatchewan in order to develop the health care system we know today. He didn't do that without any money, he did that by building a very sound base economically for his province and saying, “Now I can afford to be able to move on it.”

The other question in regard to the member Mr Sorbara, the former Minister of Labour, he would know quite well, you do not have negotiations across the way through the media. He knows as well as I do there are a number of trade union leaders who are coming to the table putting forward proposals. He also knows on the local front, there are a far greater number of local union presidents who want to be able to deal with this question.

I ask the opposition people to come clean, get on side, let's move forward with an innovative solution such as the social contract.

*Report continues in volume B.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Algoma	<b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>	ND	Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A.	L	
Beaches-Woodbine	<b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon Frances</b>	ND	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Brampton North/-Nord	McClelland, Carman	L	
Brampton South/-Sud	Callahan, Robert V.	L	
Brant-Haldimand	Eddy, Ron	L	
Brantford	<b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances
Bruce	Elston, Murray J.	L	
Burlington South/-Sud	Jackson, Cameron	PC	
Cambridge	<b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Carleton	Sterling, Norman W.	PC	
Carleton East/-Est	Morin, Gilles E.	L	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Chatham-Kent	Hope, Randy R.	ND	
Cochrane North/-Nord	Wood, Len	ND	
Cochrane South/-Sud	Bisson, Gilles	ND	
Cornwall	Cleary, John C.	L	
Don Mills	Johnson, David	PC	
Dovercourt	<b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>	ND	Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Downsview	Perruzza, Anthony	ND	
Dufferin-Peel	Tilson, David	PC	
Durham Centre/-Centre	White, Drummond	ND	
Durham East/-Est	Mills, Gord	ND	
Durham West/-Ouest	Wiseman, Jim	ND	
Durham-York	O'Connor, Larry	ND	
Eglinton	Poole, Dianne	L	
Elgin	North, Peter	ND	
Essex-Kent	Hayes, Pat	ND	
Essex South/-Sud	Vacant	L	
Etobicoke-Humber	Henderson, D. James	L	
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	<b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth A.</b>	ND	Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Etobicoke-Rexdale	<b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>	ND	Minister of Municipal Affairs / ministre des Affaires municipales
Etobicoke West/-Ouest	Stockwell, Chris	PC	
Fort William	McLeod, Lyn	L	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
Fort York	Marchese, Rosario	ND	
Frontenac-Addington	<b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio / ministre sans portefeuille
Grey	Murdoch, Bill	PC	
Guelph	Fletcher, Derek	ND	
Halton Centre/-Centre	Sullivan, Barbara	L	
Halton North/-Nord	Duignan, Noel	ND	
Hamilton Centre/-Centre	<b>Christopherson, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Hamilton East/-Est	<b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	ND	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Hamilton Mountain	<b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon Brian</b>	ND	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement et ministre délégué à l'Assurance-automobile
Hamilton West/-Ouest	<b>Allen, Hon/L'hon Richard</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère du Développement économique et du Commerce



Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Hastings-Peterborough	<b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon Elmer</b>	ND	Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
High Park-Swansea	<b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>	ND	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales
Huron	Klopp, Paul	ND	
Kenora	Miclash, Frank	L	
Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	Wilson, Gary	ND	
Kitchener	Ferguson, Will	Ind	
Kitchener-Wilmot	Cooper, Mike	ND	
Lake Nipigon/Lac-Nipigon	<b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b>	ND	Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Lambton	MacKinnon, Ellen	ND	
Lanark-Renfrew	Jordan, W. Leo	PC	
Lawrence	Cordiano, Joseph	L	
Leeds-Grenville	Runciman, Robert W.	PC	
Lincoln	Hansen, Ron	ND	
London Centre/-Centre	<b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon Marion</b>	ND	Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues / procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
London North/-Nord	Cunningham, Dianne	PC	
London South/-Sud	Winninger, David	ND	
Markham	Cousens, W. Donald	PC	
Middlesex	Mathysen, Irene	ND	
Mississauga East/-Est	Sola, John	Ind	
Mississauga North/-Nord	Offer, Steven	L	
Mississauga South/-Sud	Marland, Margaret	PC	
Mississauga West/-Ouest	Mahoney, Steven W.	L	
Muskoka-Georgian Bay	Waters, Daniel	ND	
Nepean	Daigeler, Hans	L	
Niagara Falls	Harrington, Margaret H.	ND	
Niagara South/-Sud	<b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation; chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs ; whip en chef du gouvernement
Nickel Belt	<b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon Floyd</b>	ND	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Nipissing	Harris, Michael	PC	
Norfolk	Jamison, Norm	ND	
Northumberland	Fawcett, Joan M.	L	
Oakville South/-Sud	Carr, Gary	PC	
Oakwood	Rizzo, Tony	ND	
Oriole	Caplan, Elinor	L	
Oshawa	<b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales
Ottawa Centre/-Centre	<b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b>	ND	Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement
Ottawa East/-Est	Grandmaître, Bernard C.	L	
Ottawa-Rideau	O'Neill, Yvonne	L	
Ottawa South/-Sud	McGuinty, Dalton J.P.	L	
Ottawa West/-Ouest	Chiarelli, Robert	L	
Oxford	Sutherland, Kimble	ND	
Parkdale	Ruprecht, Tony	L	
Parry Sound	Eves, Ernie	PC	
Perth	Haslam, Karen	ND	
Peterborough	Carter, Jenny	ND	
Port Arthur	<b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé
Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	Poirier, Jean	L	
Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings/Prince Edward- Lennox-Hastings-Sud	Johnson, Paul R.	ND	
Quinte	O'Neil, Hugh P.	L	
Rainy River	<b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b>	ND	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Renfrew North/-Nord	Conway, Sean G.	L	

Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Riverdale	<b>Churley, Hon/L'hon Marilyn</b>	ND	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est	Villeneuve, Noble	PC	
St Andrew-St Patrick	Akande, Zanana	ND	
St Catharines	Bradley, James J.	L	
St Catharines-Brock	Haeck, Christel	ND	
St George-St David	Murphy, Tim	L	
Sarnia	Huget, Bob	ND	
Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie	Martin, Tony	ND	
Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry	L	
Scarborough Centre/-Centre	Owens, Stephen	ND	
Scarborough East/-Est	Frankford, Robert	ND	
Scarborough-Ellesmere	<b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	Speaker / Président
Scarborough North/-Nord	Curling, Alvin	L	
Scarborough West/-Ouest	<b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b>	ND	Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Simcoe Centre/-Centre	Wessenger, Paul	ND	
Simcoe East/-Est	McLean, Allan K.	PC	
Simcoe West/-Ouest	Wilson, Jim	PC	
Sudbury	Murdock, Sharon	ND	
Sudbury East/-Est	<b>Martel, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	ND	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Timiskaming	Ramsay, David	L	
Victoria-Haliburton	Drainville, Dennis	Ind	
Waterloo North/-Nord	Witmer, Elizabeth	PC	
Welland-Thorold	Kormos, Peter	ND	
Wellington	Arnott, Ted	PC	
Wentworth East/-Est	Morrow, Mark	ND	
Wentworth North/-Nord	Abel, Donald	ND	
Willowdale	Harnick, Charles	PC	
Wilson Heights	Kwinter, Monte	L	
Windsor-Riverside	<b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien de formation et d'adaptation de la main- d'oeuvre
Windsor-Sandwich	Dadamo, George	ND	
Windsor-Walkerville	Lessard, Wayne	ND	
York Centre/-Centre	Sorbara, Gregory S.	L	
York East/-Est	Malkowski, Gary	ND	
York Mills	Turnbull, David	PC	
York North/-Nord	Beer, Charles	L	
York South/-Sud	<b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	ND	Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales
Yorkview	Mammoliti, George	ND	





# CONTENTS

Monday 21 June 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Acquired immune deficiency syndrome</b>	
Mr Murphy	1653
<b>GO bus service</b>	
Mr Tilson	1653
<b>Bloomfield and Area Business Association</b>	
Mr Paul R. Johnson	1653
<b>Forest industry</b>	
Mr Ramsay	1654
<b>Compensation for AIDS patients</b>	
Mr Jim Wilson	1654
<b>Ontario economy</b>	
Mr Mills	1654
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Caplan	1655
<b>Victims of crime</b>	
Mr Jackson	1655
<b>Peterborough Green-Up</b>	
Ms Carter	1655
<b>Brian Land</b>	
Mr Charlton	1656
Mr Conway	1656
Mr Sterling	1657
The Speaker	1657

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

<b>Land use planning</b>	
Mr Philip	1657
Mr Grandmaître	1659
Mr McLean	1660
Mr David Johnson	1660
<b>First Nations Solidarity Day</b>	
Mr Wildman	1658
Mr Miclash	1659
Mr Harnick	1660

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Transfer payments to municipalities</b>	
Mrs McLeod	1661
Mr Philip	1661
<b>Health services</b>	
Mrs McLeod	1662
Mrs Grier	1662

## Housing policy

Mrs Marland	1663
Ms Gigantes	1663

## Unemployment

Mr Carr	1664
Ms Lankin	1664

## Public opinion polls

Mr Bradley	1666
Mr Charlton	1666

## Ontario Human Rights Commission

Mr Cousens	1666
Ms Ziemba	1666

## Medical laboratories

Mr Cooper	1667
Mrs Grier	1667

## Interprovincial trade

Mr Grandmaître	1667
Ms Lankin	1668

## Libel and slander laws

Mr Harnick	1668
Mrs Boyd	1669

## London official plan

Mrs Mathysen	1669
Mr Philip	1669

## Closure of government office

Mrs Fawcett	1669
Mr Pouliot	1670

## Waste disposal

Mr Wiseman	1672
------------	------

## Bruce generating station

Mr Elston	1672
-----------	------

## Special education

Mr Stockwell	1673
--------------	------

## Closure of agricultural college

Mrs Fawcett	1673
-------------	------

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### Standing committee on finance and economic affairs

Paul R. Johnson	1673
-----------------	------

## FIRST READINGS

### Kirbryn Holdings Inc Act, 1993,

Bill Pr9	
Mr Sorbara	1674

### Paragon Financial Corp Act, 1993,

Bill Pr54	
Mr Grandmaître	1674

### Village of Merrickville Act, 1993,

Bill Pr33	
Mr Runciman	1674

### Aphasia Centre—North York Act, 1993, Bill Pr23

Mr Turnbull	1674
-------------	------

## PETITIONS

### Public service employees

Mr O'Neil	1670
-----------	------

### Native hunting and fishing

Mr McLean	1670
-----------	------

### International trade

Mr White	1671
----------	------

### Automobile insurance

Mr Daigeler	1671
-------------	------

### Gambling

Mr Drainville	1671
Mr Sterling	1671
Mr Arnott	1672
Mr Cousens	1672
Mr Murphy	1673
Mrs Marland	1673

## SECOND READINGS

### Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48

Mr Kwinter	1674
Mr Turnbull	1678
Mr Bisson	1681, 1689
Mr Stockwell	1687
Mr Perruzza	1688
Mr Runciman	1688

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Annual report, Commission on Conflict of Interest

The Speaker	1657
-------------	------



67224  
11  
-003

No. 35B



Communauté  
Parlementaire

N° 35B

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 21 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 21 juin 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Monday 21 June 1993

*Report continued from volume A*

1752

## SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

## LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Continuation of debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Further debate, the honourable member for York Centre.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I hope, during the course of the 30 minutes allotted to me in this debate, to speak through you, sir, not particularly to the members on the government side who I think have compromised and sold their souls on this bill, but to speak beyond them to the few people in the province of Ontario who are watching this debate and others who might consult what was said here through Hansard, to explain to the average citizen why the average citizen ought to be demanding, sir, that this Social Contract Act, this vicious little piece of business by the government, be defeated.

I believe this is perhaps one of the most important and one of the most crucial debates that has taken place in this Parliament. Certainly, for me, I consider it the most important piece of legislation I have ever debated or participated in debating in the eight years I've been in this Parliament.

Bill 48 is one of the most arbitrary, one of the most dangerous and one of the most vicious pieces of legislation that has ever been presented in Parliament. It is because of that that I am asking citizens of Ontario to understand what is happening here and to understand how this piece of legislation ultimately will affect them in their daily lives as citizens of this province.

There is no doubt that Ontario has a deficit problem. That's kind of a no-brainer. We all know that. We've all followed and suffered the pains of this recession and this depression. We've got a problem with the deficit and that problem obviously has to be addressed.

There's no doubt that the government is obliged, as any government would be, to exercise restraint and to bring forward to Parliament and into the administration of public policy, new and effective ways in which to, as the saying goes, "reinvent government and make

government more effective and more productive." There's no doubt about that. That's the agenda today. It's the agenda in every Canadian province. It's the agenda in the United States of America and the 50 states of the United States of America, and it's the agenda right throughout the European Community member nations. That's the agenda.

"Why is it then," the average citizen asks, "if that's the agenda, Sorbara is speaking against the bill? Why do the Liberals oppose the bill? Why is the bill so controversial?"

Let's begin with making sure that we understand what Bill 48, the Social Contract Act as it's called, does. It represents the most significant incursion into individual and collective rights that has ever been presented in any Parliament in Canada since the Second World War, and I include in that the War Measures Act that was brought to the federal Parliament by Pierre Trudeau almost 20 years ago; in fact, perhaps more than 20 years ago.

It is a greater incursion into our rights as citizens, not just the workers, the civil servants' rights, but our rights as citizens, a greater incursion than the War Measures Act. Remember, under the War Measures Act, the worst that could happen was that you could get arrested temporarily and held temporarily without being charged for something: a terrible violation of rights. But this bill in Ontario says: "We can take your salary. We can deny you the right to be heard and the right to grieve and the right to complain. We can open up your collective agreement, we can roll back your wages and employers in the broader public sector can do anything else that they want."

That's what the bill says. They can do anything else they want in order to meet Floyd Laughren's \$2-billion problem. That's what this bill says the government is empowered to do.

Eight thousand collective agreements are hereby suspended. The wages of one million working people in Ontario are hereby rolled back. The wages of one million people in Ontario are hereby frozen: Zap, you're frozen, by virtue of this act. One quarter of the working people of this province are directly affected by this bill. Arbitrarily, summarily, the Minister of Finance, Floyd Laughren, the member for whatever it is—

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Nickel Belt.

**Mr Sorbara:** The member for Nickel Belt—I thank my friend from Etobicoke—becomes the chief single employer of every public sector working person in this province. He places himself in the seat of the chair and determines for one million people what their wages will be and whether or not they will have a job, the most

arbitrary grab for power that has ever taken place in the history of Ontario, and I include in that Mitch Hepburn's war with GM workers back in the late 1930s in Oshawa.

Notwithstanding that there's this arbitrary grab for power, the people of Ontario are terribly confused and they want to know what it is about this bill that has raised the ire of so many people, not only as we debate it here in Parliament, but as it is debated in every union hall in Ontario and most of the dining rooms and restaurants and coffee shops right around the province.

I want to explain to the citizens of Ontario what's wrong with this bill, and I want to plead with the citizens of Ontario to realize what is happening here and somehow get to their local representatives, whether they be government representatives or Liberals or Tories, to get to their representatives and say, "Rethink this thing."

I'm going to discuss, in the time I have, five points, and I'm asking people to really think about these points. The first point is this: If a government can summarily cancel the rights of one million workers in Ontario, it can cancel your rights tomorrow. If we allow the government to do this arbitrarily in the way it's doing it, today it's public sector workers, tomorrow it's some other group, because once governments get an appetite for power they start to exercise it arbitrarily. Today, my rights are partially affected: My salary will be rolled back and frozen. That's okay, but a government that arbitrarily does that gets an arbitrary taste for power and starts attacking the next enemy, not the enemy of the economy but the enemy of the government.

1800

Today, for example, we heard in question period that Bob Rae spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to put a letter into the paper to explain his position.

**Mr Stockwell:** Because he can't do it himself.

**Mr Sorbara:** Because he can't do it himself, as my friend from Etobicoke says. So if you cut back the rights of public servants today, you're going to cut somebody else's rights tomorrow. It's a slippery slope into totalitarian government, and this is the first major sign.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm enjoying this speech and I think everyone should. I think a quorum should be here. This government should be able to count to 20.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

**The Acting Chair:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for York Centre has the floor.

**Mr Sorbara:** My first point was simply that this is

a totalitarian exercise of power. I invite my friends and I invite the people of the province to actually read the legislation. I'll just quote one section. Get a load of this; talk about individual rights.

"Actions of an employer"—that's any employer in the broader public sector—"taken in accordance with this act shall not be the subject of any proceeding brought by a person against the employer in relation to the terms and conditions of the person's employment and in relation to the person's release from employment."

What does that say in English? It says if you get fired, if you lose your job, you can't take any action, you can't appeal to any court, you can't grieve, you can't complain. You can go and collect poge, and Bob Rae says: "I'll give you 95% of your wages for a year, but you've got to shut up. You can't complain."

You cannot take any proceeding. That means you can't have a hearing. You can't go to an independent arbiter and say, "I've been wrongfully dismissed." That's just part of it. I could go on in that regard for hours and hours, just looking at the little arbitrary measures, the power of the Minister of Finance, the denial of the right to grieve. If your employer arbitrarily docks your pay or whatever, as long as it's in furtherance of the social contract, you don't have a right to grieve.

How did we lose the right to grieve so quickly in Ontario? If the government can, in a fascist, totalitarian way, take away the rights of these working people, it can take away anyone's rights at any time.

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I heard the member refer to the government as fascist. I don't think that's parliamentary and I think that should be withdrawn. We are not a fascist government.

**The Acting Chair:** I'm afraid I did not hear the actual comment, but I would ask the honourable member that if he did indeed say something that was so offensive to the members of the government or any other member of the House, he might perhaps apologize for that and withdraw that statement.

**Mr Sorbara:** Mr Speaker, I've described this bill as a series of totalitarian and fascist measures. I described the bill, I did not describe the government. I described the bill and I stand by my description.

Secondly, this bill—I'm asking the government members perhaps to pay attention to this part of it—destabilizes collective bargaining in Ontario in a way that no other measure could. Some people say: "That's okay. We don't like the fact that some employers have to bargain collectively with trade union representatives." To those people in particular, to those who say, "Couldn't we just get rid of the trade union movement?" I simply want to explain very briefly that although collective bargaining sometimes can lead to



strikes and lockouts and sometimes lead to friction, the collective bargaining process, where representatives of workers and representatives of employers get together and negotiate the terms of the employment, is the best system we have. In every jurisdiction that champions rights and freedoms, particularly the rights and freedoms of individuals to come together and act jointly, that collective bargaining process is right at the heart of our economic system and ought not to be summarily challenged or destroyed or destabilized. This act, because it basically suspends collective bargaining in the broader public sector for the next three years, inflicts what could possibly be a fatal wound to the collective bargaining process.

My friends opposite in the government don't seem to understand why that is. What they don't understand is that when the province, particularly those reactionary elements in the province, get a taste for destabilizing collective bargaining, their appetite simply increases and the next target is brought up for public attention, to be dealt with by this government or some successive government, and this bill, Bill 48, becomes the precedent: "Look, if you can arbitrarily suspend collective bargaining in the broader public sector, we're now asking two or three years down the road to do it for our sector: Get rid of these representatives of workers who are demanding better working conditions, get rid of these labour representatives who are arguing that we have much more to do in terms of establishing appropriate conditions for employment." This is the first major destabilization of collective bargaining in Ontario since the war, and New Democratic Party members should hang their heads in shame that they are authoring and sponsoring this bill.

Thirdly, the great tragedy in this bill is that it's not going to work. That's the great irony: The bill is not going to work; it's not going to save the government hardly a thing. Yes, if you actually end up passing this bill, wages will be rolled back, the 5% take out of everyone's pocket will be accomplished, temporarily, and wages will be frozen for three years. I remind people, I remind particularly those citizens who think that we need this three-year freeze, I ask the government members, what do you do in 1995 if inflation is at 6% or 7%? What do you do then? What kind of crisis begins to boil in one million workers who haven't had a raise, basically, in five years and see prices going up by 6% and 7%?

Don't tell me it can't happen. The Treasurer can't predict a deficit one year to the next. Don't tell me that he can say what inflation is going to be a year and a half from now. The likelihood is that, as the economy starts to recover, we're going to go into a period of new inflation. This bill says to one million workers that they will have no raise. Their purchasing power will begin to deteriorate by 5% and 6% when that starts to happen.

This bill says, "Come back and see us in March 1996." There, my friends, the thing explodes; there it explodes. The new right to strike will have been implemented. One million workers will be counting the days until they can finally make it up. Mark my words, I tell my friends in the government, there will be demands for wage increases in 1996 of upwards of 25% to 30% by one million workers in this province. That could once again cripple the economy. It could once again so destabilize Ontario that we could fall into another recession, because at some point that's got to be made up. You're pushing it all to 1996.

It's going to explode; perhaps not in your faces, but it's going to explode in the face of some government. There will be so much anger and so much discontent, having locked up the collective bargaining process for some three years, that it could just set Ontario into its own private recession, separate and apart from the recovering economies of the rest of Canada and the US. Mark my words, we will see demands for increases in wages of 25% to 30% when this vicious piece of business comes to an end.

#### 1810

So what should have been done? What's the alternative? I agree that today we need to deal with the wage question. We need to make one incision in those collective agreements and in a graduated way step wages back somewhat, in a graduated way, so that if you make \$120,000 and you're a deputy minister, you might have to take a 12% cut, but if you're a worker making perhaps \$25,000 or \$30,000, the cut that you take is minimal, a half a per cent or 1%. Then you move the yardsticks back, and then you sew up the incision and you allow the process of collective bargaining to work itself out so that it can respond to the economy of tomorrow and next month and next year and two years and three years down the road. That is something that would work and that is something that I could support, because it's a single incision and it doesn't destabilize Ontario and freeze Ontario Bob Rae style over the course of the next three years.

The other thing that is so tragically wrong with this bill is this: Among the nine million people in Ontario who are not public sector workers, there's an appetite for this. There is a fantasy developing out there that somehow the teachers and the doctors and the nurses and the firefighters and the police officers and the clerks and the person who takes your form at the government office, there's a growing sentiment that these people somehow have been taking too much and "We've got to get to them."

That's a fantasy. It's a political fantasy, and you on the other side are playing on that. You on the other side are allowing that fantasy, that lie, to fester.

Who are these public sector workers who have grown fat? They're the people who teach my children. They're

the people who protect my community. They're the nurse who sees my son when I take him to emergency at 3 o'clock in the morning. It's the guard who identifies my parking spot in this building. It's the man or woman who goes up to plant trees in northern Ontario all summer long. It's one million people who deliver collectively the services that we've demanded as a people.

I admit there is a mood out there that somehow we have got to exact some pain on those one million people, and you are playing on that. Politically, your Premier, your Minister of Finance and every one of you are playing on that sympathy, and that is dangerous territory. That is a foul and ugly thing to do, particularly for politicians and community leaders who have historically spoken up for the integrity of the workplace and the rights of workers.

You're playing on it. You're allowing editorialists to write about the inefficiency of our school system and the inefficiency of our health care system and the inefficiency of ministries of government.

I want to tell my friends opposite, those are lies. Our health care system, my friends, is not in crisis. Our education system is not in crisis. Our social service system is not in crisis. It is our economy that is in crisis.

If the New Democratic Party government could do something to restart the economy, then we could afford the kinds of services that historically we have come to enjoy and take advantage of in Ontario. If we could only get people back to work, if we could only rekindle the economic vitality that we had in the 1980s, then no one would be talking about laying off nurses and firing teachers and reducing the size of the police force. We wouldn't be talking about it. But after almost three years of New Democratic Party government, I have seen not one measure to rekindle the economy, to create new economic growth.

I'm glad to see that the Minister of Agriculture and Food is here, because he will understand this analogy. It is as if the government collectively went to the orchard and saw that the trees weren't bearing any fruit, or that it was measly and shrivelled, and instead of addressing the problem, they started to get the big shears out, pruning. "This branch is bearing no fruit; cut it off. This branch is bearing no fruit; cut it off," and you keep cutting at the tree and trimming it back and waiting to see if fruit will be produced on what's left.

And no one is feeding the soil, the economic soil in Ontario, which produces the wealth and the resources that we need to have a vital health care system and to educate our children in the way in which they deserve to be educated and to fund our universities and our colleges in the way in which they must be if we are going to be competitive in a global, information-based economy. None of you is talking about that.

None of you, I say to the government members, have really come to address the core of the issue: Our economy cries out for new growth. If we could ever address that question, then we wouldn't need this vicious social contract which plays upon the fear of Ontarians that somehow those who work for government have grown too fat. You play upon that and in playing upon that, you do a huge disservice to one million workers, virtually all of whom are ordinary citizens like you and I, who get up in the morning and send their children off to school and go to work and put in a full day. The difference is that what they receive comes from the taxpayers, and you have allowed yourselves to be sucked in by that fantasy that says: "It's their fault. The reason we have no economic growth is because those working people who serve us in our schools and our hospitals and our social service agencies have somehow missed the mark. They've grown too fat."

You mustn't do this. You mustn't destroy collective bargaining to play upon that sentiment. You mustn't pretend that somehow you have a crystal ball and can see what the economy is going to look like three years hence and therefore say to one million workers, "Zap, you're frozen." You will create such anger, such resentment, such hostility, that in the end our schools will become destabilized.

What do you think is going to happen once you've passed this bill or forced them into negotiations that call for the same thing that's in the bill in any event? The frustration of teachers will be such that they'll say: "Fine, we'll work to rule. We're done with voluntarily committing ourselves to our schools." The nurses and the doctors will say, "Fine, we'll work to rule or we'll go somewhere else." Those who work so hard delivering particularly the social services will say: "Fine, we'll work to rule. Forget the case loads, forget the problems out there." And they will wait and wait and when the three-year clock stops ticking and reaches zero, there will be an explosion in this province for catch-up and revenge the like of which we have never seen before, and you are asking us to vote in favour of that in this piece of legislation.

I say to the members of the House and those people who are listening to this debate that we must not quickly and easily curtail the rights of citizens. We have a 125-year tradition in parliaments like this of establishing and identifying and refining and enhancing those rights. Yes, we are in a recession; I think it's a depression. Yes, we must come to grips with the cost of government. Yes, we must begin to reshape how we deliver services. All of that is the subject of unanimous consent in Ontario and anywhere else. All of that is self-evident. But what is not self-evident is that in order to achieve that with one blow, you can set back the clock almost 50 years in terms of the rights of citizens



and set the clock back 50 years in terms of the rights of people to organize together and express their rights together.

1820

This does not give you an excuse to destabilize collective bargaining, not just in the public sector but right throughout the private sector; and not just here in Ontario, because you know what will happen, you know how this game is played. You know that everyone in North America right now is watching to see how much pain Ontario can inflict on its public sector workers. They're watching in Tennessee and they're watching in Calgary and they're watching in Nova Scotia and they're watching in New Hampshire. They're watching everywhere.

This is the test: "If Bob Rae, the great social democrat, the man who used to speak with a social conscience, can do this to his public sector workers—freeze them where they are for three years, cut back their pay arbitrarily, try and bribe them to the bargaining table—if Bob Rae, that eloquent, fair-haired young Rhodes Scholar can do that, by God, just think what we can do here in Tennessee or North Dakota or California or wherever we are experiencing a nuisance."

I plead with the members of the House, particularly the government members, to rethink what they are doing and understand how important it is that this legislation not pass.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to pick up on a point that the member from York was speaking about with respect to the deferment. The deferment is a rather interesting issue. They have said in the legislation that if you're considered a necessary service or a mandated service, you don't necessarily have to give pay pause days; you begin to bank those days.

I think this is a rather interesting point, because when you're dealing with a place like, say, Metropolitan Toronto, this is what you people should think about: 60% of the employees of Metropolitan Toronto would be considered mandated. They go from homes for the aged to child care to police to ambulance services and so on and so on. So according to your social contract, these people could not take their pay pause days; they would begin to bank their pay pause days, and they would bank them for some three years.

Imagine that very quickly in rough calculations: The broader public payroll is some \$43 billion, you're trying to save 5% of \$43 billion, and roughly 50% or 60% of those people you're trying to make the savings on can bank their pay pause days; they can bank 36 pay pause days per person till 1996. Add up all those people who have banked pay pause days, and come 1996, there's going to be a bill owing by municipalities of some \$2 billion or \$3 billion. That's what this proposed saving

would be: \$2 billion or \$3 billion in banked days, and municipalities are going to end up having to foot that bill.

So the suggestion to the public that you're saving 5% is grossly misconstrued and grossly unreasonable or unfair to any fairminded individual who would read this legislation.

Mark my words. Come 1996, municipalities, hospitals and school boards are going to have billions of dollars in payments to make because of your social contract, due to banked holidays not forced upon mandated services. If that's what you're trying to accomplish, it seems rather onerous for such a small period of—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Further questions and/or comments?

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** I agree with a lot of people, and I'm not attempting to deny or minimize the deficit problem which exists. We all know it's been very difficult to grapple with this deficit problem. We talk about the private sector unions out there which had to meet, which had to come back to their people with a pay scale less than they wanted, which had difficulty in finding solutions. But when they did that, they had one thing going for them: They had the right to collective bargaining. It was tough to come back to their unions and say, "We have to take a wage rollback" or "There will be layoffs," but they had the right to bargain with their employers for that. And that's the one thing in this legislation that really hits me, when you look at putting aside the rights to collective bargaining.

I know there are unions out there who have brought in 0% because we asked them to. I know there are unions out there who have negotiated 10-month jobs instead of 12-month jobs because we've asked them to. Now we're saying to them: "Now we want you to come back, and we're facilitating"—I love that word in this legislation—"negotiations. We're asking you to come back and give up more, and if you don't give up more, then we're going to do it anyway." That is not collective bargaining.

I received a letter recently that I would like to say one quick thing about. "It's comparable to what is done in some jurisdictions when the guilty party is asked to choose the method of execution."

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I listened attentively as my colleague for York Centre gave a fairly good recitation of the concerns that focus on this legislation. It's a concern to me that unspoken in all of the high-sounding rhetoric that comes from the government are any words that would describe what will take place in the delivery of public services to the people of this province.

We're all in favour of restraint, but I think it's pretty fair to say, as I go from place to place in my riding and speak to so many individuals, that the concern is very

genuine indeed about the ability to preserve health care, to ensure that education for our children's future is not only preserved but in fact enhanced.

There are a number of people who now reside in the public sector and broader public sector who are quite concerned that the mandates which they believe have been given unto them, in fact even required of them under legislative instruction, cannot now be met. In fact, the extended discussions that have emanated from the social contract and the compromising discussion that has resulted as a result of the meddling of the Premier and the Finance minister in the setting of budgets at local levels have caused the types of disruptions now, when we're in a process of renewing and revitalizing or at least attempting to do that with our public sector, of probably putting on hold all the reforms that might effect good in the broader public sector.

I have several areas which I'm sure the people would be interested in hearing, and I'll be talking about them later, but it seems to me that particularly the problems that will emanate from the financial crisis facing the conservation authorities and the ability to deal with what is going to be cut back from their budgets are obviously going to compromise the public trusts that have been allocated to those organizations.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I listened with great interest to the member for York Centre and his comments. His comments were very, very eloquent, as they always are. If he'd had the opportunity to speak longer than 30 minutes, I'm sure he would have on this particular bill, but I found a couple of things I wanted to comment on with respect to his presentation.

He is a former member of the Liberal Party, the government from 1985 to 1990, and certainly we find that during those years—I'm sure the member would readily admit this—in boom times, I give you, the money was spent as fast as it came in in those days. Had there been some sort of measure of restraint during those years, I think we would be in a different situation today, perhaps not even talking about a social contract. Had something like the Alberta heritage fund been set up with the money that was coming in at that time, setting aside some money for a rainy day, if that principle had been applied to those years in the late 1980s when times were booming, I think we'd be in a different situation today.

1830

The member talked about his concern about the end of certain rights and collective bargaining rights being trampled upon. I think he used the word "totalitarian." I've heard that word in this debate, but I wondered, listening to him, if he would support any initiatives put forward by the government which would reduce the annual compensation bill that the government has to pay within the Ontario public service and the broader public sector. Would he support any initiative to reduce that

compensation? I would ask him that question.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think you need a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for York Centre has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Sorbara:** I don't have very much to add. I do want to comment on questions or answer the questions that my friend from Wellington posed.

First, would I support any legislative initiatives dealing with wages; the answer is yes. I think if he refers back to my remarks in Hansard, I put a very specific proposal forward as to how that could be done without destabilizing collective bargaining.

The second issue, of course, is the one that the Tories are taking up now. That is to point back to the heyday of 1985 to 1990 when I and the Liberals were in power and David Peterson was the Premier. The suggestion is that there was a great deal of spending and taxes were rolling in at a record rate. Of course, it's true that we had the benefit of a very strong economy. We had unemployment levels that were at 3% and 4% in the urban areas and 5% perhaps in the rural areas, and these were very good times indeed. In Liberal times, most people had jobs.

I don't want to get into that debate except to make one point. It offends me to no end to hear New Democrats making that argument, because during that period, the New Democrats under the dramatic leadership of the dramatic crusader Bob Rae every day in this Parliament were identifying another agency of government that was underfunded. On day one, the universities were underfunded; day two, the colleges; day three, the welfare system; day four, the hospitals; day five, it was another agency. Every day in Parliament, the New Democrats were making proposals for additional spending. Do you know what? They were right; those agencies did need resources because we were in a period of dramatic growth, and we're proud of our record in responding to that growth.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Before I get into the specifics of the legislation, I do want to make some reference to the comments made by the Liberal member for York Centre. I share his concern about the position of the NDP government in many respects, but I think it's unfair not to make some passing reference to the fact that Bill 48 is very much a part of the Liberal legacy left to this province.



He talks about taking positions which are in support of collective bargaining and organized labour in this province, and I think we should hark back to at least a couple of issues in respect to positions taken by federal Liberal governments in the past. I recall Robert Stanfield as the leader of the official opposition, the Conservative Party, back some years ago talking about the need to institute wage and price controls in a way in which we could get the Canadian economy under control. Of course, the Trudeau Liberal government was vehemently opposed to that and won the election, essentially, on that one issue, and then immediately went about instituting wage and price controls.

Back in I think it was 1979, the short-lived Conservative government of Joe Clark brought in a budget with a proposal to increase taxes on fuel by 16 cents a gallon, I believe, and again the government was defeated on that budget; that was the primary focus of the campaign. Mr Trudeau was resurrected, the Liberal government came back into power, and what did they do? One of the first things they did was immediately raise the gasoline tax by I believe it was in the order of 40 cents a gallon.

When we hear all these concerns by the Liberal representative about organized labour and infringing on contracts and the bargaining process, I think we should take it all with a grain of salt, because the fact is, as the member for York Centre made reference to, the Liberals governed during an economic boom, and during that time they increased expenditures at double the rate of inflation and paid for this spending binge with 33 tax hikes and a 30% or \$10-billion increase in the provincial debt over their term in office.

Another concern, which certainly relates to Bill 48 and the whole question of the growth of government and the public service in this province and the cost that's associated with that growth, is that under the Liberals the size of the Ontario public service grew from 80,142 in March 1985 to 88,267 in March 1990, and the public service payroll costs, wages and benefits, during that period of time jumped by 60%, from \$2.7 billion to \$4.4 billion, during the Liberals' time in office.

Obviously, we can't lay all of that on their doorstep. For a period of time during the Liberal reign there was an accord with the NDP party and much of the agenda was a shared agenda between the NDP and the Liberal Party, so they as well have to assume some of the responsibility for what occurred during that time; they can't simply lay it on the doorstep of the Liberals. But there's no doubt that in terms of the three years during which the Liberals had a 94-seat majority in this House, they have to accept sole responsibility for what occurred during that time, and obviously they were not prepared to do that. They knew what was coming.

As we can recall, when an election was called in

1990, the Treasurer of the time, Mr Nixon, indicated that the province was going to be looking at a modest surplus. In fact there was a significant deficit when the NDP came into power and had a look at the books, and of course it's been all downhill since that time.

Of course, look at the initial response of the NDP in terms of the Treasurer making a very significant error in his first budget, his decision to try and spend our way of recession while every other government in Canada was cutting back, exercising restraint and trying to deal with the problem at that time. Mr Laughren and his colleagues decided they were going to do something different, based on the long-held socialist belief that they could spend their way out of a very significant recession, and of course it backfired, but part of that effort was a significant increase to the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, pay hikes of nearly 6%.

At that time, our party and our leader, Michael Harris, were calling on the government to apply a 2% cap on pay hikes in the public sector. We were very concerned back in 1990 and even before, in respect to the spending practices of the Liberal government and then the intended spending practices of the NDP with its first budget and subsequent budgets.

Look at what's occurred, with the significant deficits over the period of time that this government's been in office and then its reaction to a projected \$17-billion deficit. There's a public relations game that's been under way for some time, that by instituting Bill 48 we'll have what is described as some sort of panacea, that we are going to get this deficit down to something like \$10 billion. We doubt that can be achieved. It's still—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville is making a tremendous amount of sense and he should be listened to. A quorum should be present.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Is there a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1840

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville may continue his participation in the debate.

**Mr Runciman:** I want to make reference to some of the things that our party has attempted to do over the past number of years in terms of getting its message across to the government, through Mike Harris and various critics and I think virtually every member of the Conservative caucus, in delivering a message of fiscal responsibility.

In the first volume of our New Directions series of policy papers we called for, among other things, reduc-

tions in the size of the Ontario public service and the privatization of government functions and crown agencies. In our 1993 pre-budget opinion, our caucus called for a moratorium on the non-profit housing program, which I want to make some reference to again.

We've heard the Minister of Housing respond to questions from our critic, the member for Mississauga South, Mrs Marland, in terms of our concerns about the significant cost to the taxpayers of the province in respect to this government's policies related to non-profit housing. We believe the people of this province would be much better served if we got the private sector involved in the provision of housing, and not the government.

What's happening now is that we're putting people into these houses who make no real contribution to Ontario society, in many respects, and are being subsidized by the Ontario taxpayers, some up to the tune of \$1,000 a month. I believe the average is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$840 a month. These are significant expenditures and ones that the current Minister of Housing and apparently her colleagues are unwilling to deal with, I assume because it conflicts with some sort of party ideology in terms of the government being the major developer and landlord in this province and squeezing out the private sector. As a result, the private sector development industry is suffering significantly and indeed the taxpayers of this province are suffering significantly.

We've talked about a crackdown on health care fraud. The Provincial Auditor has indicated that health care fraud could be in the vicinity of \$800 million a year. Again we see very little happening in respect of this concern, a significant one. If we're talking about achieving savings in this government and not costing jobs in the public sector at a time when the private sector is certainly suffering, certainly this is one area which the government should have, could have keyed on in terms of rooting out significant fraud and significant cost to the people of this province.

We've also talked about a multi-year freeze on program spending as a key to a long-term strategy of deficit reduction, and of course we have not seen that occur. In fact, as we've indicated, the principle of restraint is something we've been talking about and calling for for a significant period of time, and Bill 48 is indeed a restraint measure.

We have significant concerns about a number of elements of this legislation. We may have to find ourselves at least in support of the principle, but we will have significant and meaningful amendments to make during the process in the hope that the government will agree with these amendments so that this legislation, while achieving the objective of restraint, will be much fairer in the way it deals with the public service in this province and will have much more beneficial long-term

effects in terms of the restructuring of the provincial government.

Some of the things I'm talking about in terms of restraint are modest, but they're indications of this government being unwilling to deal with spending problems. Indeed, they have not exercised the spending restraint in many ways by which they could have achieved the same sort of saving they're hoping to achieve through Bill 48.

I want to talk about a couple of things. The expenditures on polling have been raised before in this House. Although the NDP in opposition were vitriolic in terms of their opposition to government polling, now we see a release through, I gather, a freedom of information request indicating that the government has spent something like \$1.3 million on polling during its two and a half to almost three years in office. That may be modest when we're talking about a \$54-billion or \$55-billion total budget in this province, but it's indicative of the spending practices of this government.

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture and Food):** And what are the Tories doing?

**Mr Runciman:** We're talking about positions you've taken in the past. If you want to review Hansard and some of the vitriol that spewed forth from this side of the House about polling by not only Conservative governments of the past but Liberal governments of the past, I think you'd have a tough time defending any spending on polling, and most of it political in nature.

I gather Liberal and Conservative governments of the past could have and have been criticized for this sort of spending, but I have never seen anything so blatantly political as the budget insert that was put into all of the daily newspapers, trying to defend the government's recent budget and spelling out the benefit of this wonderful document for all the taxpayers and residents of the province of Ontario.

I can remember some of the things we were involved in as a Conservative government, some of the slogans. What was it, "Preserve Ontario" or something like that? It was questioned by opposition members because of the analogy between Progressive Conservatives and "Preserve Ontario," and a bunch of slogans that came out of our party when we were in power, but I've never seen anything as blatant and as political as this budget insert that cost the taxpayers of this province, we're told, \$300,000.

I don't know how much the full-page ad that was inserted to defend the government in terms of the social contract cost. I don't know how many papers it ran in. Someone was suggesting it cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I can understand that. I know a full-page ad in the *Toronto Star* is not an insignificant expenditure.

Individually, these are modest numbers when we look



at the total spending effort of the government, but collectively, they add up and they certainly indicate the priorities of this government.

An item that I have raised on occasion, and the member for Perth has responded to me in her capacity in cabinet in respect to this matter, is TVO. I've had a lot of trouble in respect to TVO and its operations, specifically the operation of La Chaîne. When you raise this sort of issue, it's a sacred cow. Once you raise this kind of issue, you're accused of not understanding the fact of a minority in this province and recognizing its needs and its rights. I say baloney.

I'm certainly one who is very supportive of providing services to the language minority in this province, but I believe in providing services that are needed, that are merited and that are utilized, and La Chaîne is an excellent example.

Mr Bernard Ostry appeared before my committee some time ago in respect to spending concerns at TVO, about having eight television sets in his office, that sort of extravagance which upset members of the NDP and members on this side of the House. But the other side of an extravagance that came out during those deliberations was that an exorbitant amount of the TVO budget, I think it was \$35 million or \$36 million, was going towards the operation of La Chaîne. The other element that came out during these discussions was that virtually no one is watching La Chaîne; virtually no one is watching this network.

What we have is a French-language network and an English-language network. Before the creation of La Chaîne, which was a political decision, with the support of both the federal Conservatives and the provincial Liberals, TVO, the English-language network, offered 14 hours, I believe it was, per week of French-language programming. We have now created a French-language arm which is taking up at least a third of the budget. Virtually no one is watching it, and we're still providing the 14 hours of French-language broadcasting on the English arm of TVO.

1850

That's the sort of thing, when we have these political sacred cows, that means we don't deal with real needs of real people in this province. Instead, and I've seen it for over 12 years in this place, we're meeting these so-called political needs, sending out these symbolic messages which cost us millions and millions and millions of dollars and meet no real need out there in the regions of this province and do not really satisfy the needs or aspirations, in my view, of the francophones in this province. I think most of them, if they're prepared to sit down and talk about the fiscal realities of this province, would be quite prepared to see one network providing service in both languages in this province at a much more economical cost to the taxpayers of Ontario.

I don't want to go on about that particular subject

because I'm sure I'll get letters; once you touch this subject, you're accused of all sorts of nasty things and you can't offer common sense. I've faced those kinds of bullets in the past and I've lived through them.

I want to talk about a couple of other modest things. I won't say La Chaîne is modest, at \$36 million. I put a couple of questions on the order paper respecting some things that happened with the Ministry of Financial Institutions. The government has abolished the Ministry of Financial Institutions and merged it into the Ministry of Finance. A couple of things have happened over there recently.

One of the deputy ministers, Mr Robert Simpson, I understand was looked upon as being too close to the Liberal government and too close perhaps to the member for Bruce because of all of the deliberations that were undertaken during auto insurance deliberations and the development of the no-fault auto insurance program. Mr Simpson, I believe, was felt to be by the current government, the NDP government, too closely aligned with the Liberal Party of Ontario. As a result, he was given his walking papers, but I want to say, those were pretty expensive walking papers. He's been out of the government for over a year now, but he's been on full salary for all that time. So we have this one Deputy Minister of Financial Institutions who's been effectively fired by the government out there drawing a full salary for two years while he's not employed and not providing any useful service to the taxpayers of Ontario.

What did the NDP government do? They reached into Manitoba and brought in a Mr Charles Kang as the deputy minister in Financial Institutions. Then a very short period of time after Mr Kang was here, they decided to do away with that ministry, so again they had to reach an accommodation with Mr Kang. So now Mr Kang is on almost full salary because he reached a negotiated settlement with the NDP government.

In effect, we have no ministry any more, no Ministry of Financial Institutions, but we have two deputy ministers being paid one full salary and one almost-full salary for no ministry.

That's the sort of thing this government has undertaken, rather than biting the bullet and dealing with tough matters. This is the sort of waste the public is unaware of that goes on on an almost daily basis while the NDP members over there laugh their heads off about this sort of waste. It's atrocious, it's offensive and it should upset all of the hardworking public sector employees out there who feel their jobs are in jeopardy, because many of those people see this sort of waste occurring around them on a daily basis. These two issues were brought to my attention by a public sector employee who is very concerned about her job and said this is the sort of waste.

When they went to move Financial Institutions from 555 Yonge, they brought in someone. They have

accommodation officers in the ministry. What did they do? They brought someone in on contract, a \$75,000 contract, to coordinate the move from 555 Yonge down to the Eaton Centre. That's the sort of waste: 75,000 bucks out the window, while they have all these accommodation officers in the ministry sitting on their fannies.

It's no wonder that public sector employees are very much upset, very much concerned about their own security and at the same time concerned about the waste this government is engaged in and not doing anything to deal with.

This has been talked about and I'm not going to get into it at length: all of the changed attitudes we're witnessing on the part of the NDP in respect of positions you and I heard and the member for Markham heard for many, many years, and the vehemence of its views with respect to collective bargaining, the sanctity of collective bargaining, the sanctity of collective agreements, that there's no way these agreements could be touched. Now we see them supporting, endorsing and defending legislation that in effect is going to, in many instances, gut the negotiating process and create chaos in the public sector.

As I said, we very strongly endorse the principle of restraint. We have been calling for it for some time. We've been consistent. Mike Harris and the Ontario Progressive Conservatives have been consistent in calling for government restraint, downsizing the public sector and making the public sector much more efficient and much more effective. We believe most public sector employees would agree with that, and we believe it can be done without loss of employment. It can be done and could be done without loss of employment.

We see this dramatic shifting of views by members in the NDP, though. I don't want to get away from that without some comment. There's the old comment that power corrupts. Power corrupts.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation and Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs):** We are not corrupt, sir. Be careful.

**Mr Runciman:** I saw it in my day. I was a backbencher when Premier Davis decided that he was going to buy into Suncor. I don't know if Mr Pouliot was a member at that time or not. Mr Davis made a decision that he was going to buy into Suncor, which I felt went against everything I believed in as a Conservative. I had a very difficult time dealing with that, and my final decision was not to support it. I decided not to support it because it went against what I believed were Conservative principles. I suffered somewhat as a result of that decision, but I want to say I've never regretted it, never regretted it for one moment, and certainly history has proven me to be correct with respect to it being an extremely bad decision that did not benefit Ontario in any way, shape or form and in fact cost at least half a billion dollars, a sinkhole once we got into that mess.

But when I'm taking the position I am taking here—I saw it in government and I suppose I fell victim to it on occasion as well, that once you get involved in government and the perks of office, they're very difficult, they're very persuasive, they're very seductive. In this case, we see members over here who I felt over the years were very strong, principled individuals who would not in any way, shape or form stand up and support this kind of gutting of the collective bargaining process, but what we're seeing here is nodding and smiling and defending of this kind of process.

Even though we on this side of the House personally support the principle of restraint, it's very difficult for us to accept the fact that we've heard members like the minister who's sitting here today, the member for Lake Nipigon, talking about the sanctity of the collective bargaining process and that it has to be protected at all costs and now we know that when this bill comes to a vote, he's going to stand up and vote with the government. Why? Why is he going to vote? I'd like to hear him get up during the course of this debate and offer his views. But I don't think any of us on this side of the House will be able to accept them. I think he has been corrupted, if you will, by the perks of power, by the salary, by the driver, by the expense account, by the fancy offices, by all the perks of office. I think it's a fair conclusion to draw.

1900

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your leadership on whether it's a point of order or a point of privilege. I will quote. I have a lot of respect for the member, but when the member says the member from Lake Nipigon has been corrupted by the perks of office, I think it goes—

**The Acting Speaker:** That's not a point of order.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The tone goes somewhat beyond the decorum and good manners that are the tradition of this House, and I take offence. I am not corrupted. I am not a corrupt person; indeed, quite the opposite.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** Like all members here, I am an honourable member trying to serve my constituency.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. All members are honourable members and all members, if they wish to participate, should stand up, be recognized, and the Chair will recognize them to participate. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** The comments I made related to the member for Lake Nipigon, the Minister of Transportation, I made with no animosity. In fact, I made those comments with deep regret, because I have respect for the member. I worked with him on this side of the House in opposition, and I've seen him as a member of the government as well. I certainly had a great deal of respect for his views, his principled stands, in the past.



Like most of us on this side of the House, I have a great deal of difficulty with the fact that he can now stand in this House and say that this sort gutting of contracts and of the collective bargaining process is something that he can live with. I have a great deal of difficulty accepting that, and I have to draw the conclusion in terms of what I said. I can see no other reason for this enormous flip-flop occurring on the part of him and a significant number of other members of his party.

I want to get a few things on the record in the brief time I have in respect to the public service and relate them to some things that have happened in my own riding. I know some of the public servants have a great deal to be concerned about, justifiably so, in respect to what's happening in Bill 48. But I think there's another message that we're hearing from the public as well. We've seen significant problems in the economy in Ontario. We've seen significant job losses, many manufacturing jobs lost for ever in this province, and the private sector prepared to—we had the member for Cochrane South talking about steel workers. In my riding, Phillips Cables is a company that I would like to use as an example.

That company was faced with significant losses, the closure of its plant in Brockville. They were not being competitive any longer, and they had to sit down with the union. The options were either to look at concessions, reopening the collective agreement and looking at concessions to make it competitive, or closing the company down. That union was prepared to sit down and save jobs and make its company more competitive. They agreed to a four-year wage freeze, they reduced shift premiums, and they've adopted a much more flexible job description process where employees can work at a variety of jobs.

That sort of innovative approach, cooperative approach, has to be achieved by the public sector as well, and public servants have to recognize that that sort of accommodation has to be achieved. I don't think the heavy-handed approach of Bill 48 is the appropriate way to go, but they have to recognize that those kinds of accommodations are made necessary by the reality of the current Ontario economy and the fiscal reality faced by this government. Many of the difficulties that we're now facing, of course, were brought upon by the free spending of the Liberal government and the free spending of the NDP that succeeded them. But we have to come to grips with it.

If anyone watched W5 last night, it talked to former Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan and about the public service there again having difficulty in coming to grips with the fact that Saskatchewan is effectively bankrupt. Their bond issues are now described as junk bonds. I'm told a lot of the latest issue in Ontario, the \$3-billion issue, is languishing, \$400 million to \$500 million, at

very attractive interest rates. We're now coming out with another issue. Ontario is facing a similar problem where no one wants to buy our bond issues unless we elevate the interest premiums, which again puts another burden on Ontario taxpayers. We're in a very difficult situation.

Our party has been strongly supportive of restraint, and I believe we're going to give serious consideration to support of this legislation in second reading because of the restraint message it sends out.

We're going to be bringing in substantive amendments during the process. Hopefully, the government is going to listen and adopt those amendments, because they will make the bill much fairer in terms of how it deals with the public servants and also in terms of the long-term restructuring of government in this province and also achieving long-term benefits for all of us as residents of this province. Thank you for your time, Mr Speaker.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I would like to record my appreciation for the remarks from the member from Leeds-Grenville. I think one of the major thrusts in his address has been the waste in government and the unusual amount of excessive spending, self-serving spending, that has gone on over the past few years. When you crystallize that, it's hard to think just of one event; it's the accumulation of all the different things that have gone on. His illustration of the Ministry of Financial Institutions, as much as any, conveys the tremendous amount of waste at the top. We see this within every ministry.

If government had a program review within its organization, and this is really the question I want to ask the member to specifically address, if there were a program review of all government programs, would that not be the kind of beginning that should be taken?

The problem is probably that the New Democrats have been so busy promoting spending for so long that it becomes very difficult for them now to have a comprehensive review of government and say, "Let's be fairminded in what's going on." I think the government also has forgotten that its job is not just to knee-jerk in a panicky way to what's going on today, that there should be a long-term resolution of the problems we've got.

That is a lot of the concern we have as a caucus with this bill. Enforcing 12 days off for three years is really only going to provide an interim solution to the high spending of government, and then three years from now, we're going to be right back into it. What we're proposing instead is that there be a wage freeze and a hiring freeze during that period of time. I think the member for Leeds-Grenville has addressed that very adequately; none the less, there is a structural change needed, and it would be important for us to begin to look at the programs—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Further questions and/or comments?

**Mr Elston:** I listened intently to the speech at the same time as I was listening to the member for Etobicoke West explain some of the difficulties in which the government obviously finds itself as a result of its movement from what was once described as the people's agenda, or Agenda for People, that has now become sort of the Tory manifesto of Ontario, and how difficult it must be.

But I was interested, even while we were going through that very intellectually inspiring discussion with a member from the government party, that I was able to overhear the member for Leeds-Grenville talking about the member for Lake Nipigon, about how that member, who is a member of the cabinet, the executive council, is going to support the government in this funny piece of legislation.

I missed the part where I think the member for Leeds-Grenville said he was also going to be supporting this bill. I was surprised to hear the earlier speaker, the member for York Mills, likewise say that the Tories in Ontario were going to be supporting the government. That would seem to indicate to me that the member for Leeds-Grenville and the member for Lake Nipigon are brothers in arms in this particular endeavour.

I used to describe the member from Leeds in other days, more halcyon days, as we like to think of them, as the left-leaning member from Leeds; at one point, I thought he was becoming extremely progressive. But it turns to me now to say that I misjudged him, because he has become as Tory as the NDP has. It seems to confuse me just a slight bit that the member from Leeds would be critical of a government member for supporting bad legislation when he and his leader are likewise supporting bad legislation.

All this to bring us back to the topic of what public services are going to be left after the Tories and New Democrats are done with this province.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member's time has expired.

**Mr Stockwell:** First I want to compliment the member for Leeds-Grenville on his comments. They were well stated and I think a lot of sense was made, particularly when he spoke of the issue with respect to Suncor, that his principles were offended on that issue and that he said so.

I will say too that I note the member for Bruce, the Liberal—this is the one time the Liberals finally make a decision about something and they can't stop crowing, for heaven's sake. It's been two and a half years that we've been in this Legislature waiting for this Liberal crowd to make a decision on absolutely anything and they wouldn't, until finally Bill 48 comes down. They must have caucused for about a week. They probably

wrung their hands, saying, "Gosh, if we make a decision, we're going to offend somebody." Eventually, they finally made a decision. Let it be said: They finally made a decision.

Maybe it's a first; probably the last. Thank you. We admit it: You made a decision. I am not sure how they get dressed in the morning for fear of understanding which suit they're going to put on.

**Mr Elston:** We only have one. We can only afford one. We are not New Democrats and Tories.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Bruce suggests that he only has one. Thank goodness, or he'd never be here on time.

1910

To get back to the member for Leeds-Grenville, his was in fact an excellent dissertation and some of the questions he brought forward I thought were very germane and should be answered by the members opposite. I note that they're not taking the opportunity. It's a shame, because I would really like to see some of these cabinet ministers, who have completely sold out any principle they had, defend 8,000 collective agreements being reopened, rollback of wages and freezes. I really would love to see them, as they're beaver away there signing forms, defend this kind of decision, because I don't think they can.

**The Acting Speaker:** We can accommodate one final participant.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Leeds and East Grenville as he spoke on this issue, and he dealt to a very large extent with the issue of restraint and government spending.

**Mr Elston:** Just Grenville.

**Mr Bradley:** It's Grenville, I understand, not East Grenville.

One thing I would like to note for the members of the House is that I can recall as a minister having to answer questions of the other side of the House. I cannot recall one time that I was ever asked a question in which I was asked to reduce the resources of the Ministry of the Environment, reduce the staff of the Ministry of the Environment or reduce the budget of the Ministry of the Environment. In fact, members from all sides of the House, including government members in those days and Conservative and NDP members, constantly asked questions that implied that the government should be spending more money, should be hiring more staff, should be purchasing more equipment and should be intervening to a greater extent in environmental matters.

I don't criticize them. I do not stand here criticizing members of the House for that. I simply think it's important to remember the context of a booming economy, of a strong economy, and what members of the Legislature asked for. Members are actually trying



to reflect what people in their communities want and the pressures of the day as they might relate to the popular media.

We have a different circumstance now. This government can't possibly be meeting all those obligations, can't possibly be meeting everyone's expectations, and the questions coming from the House from opposition members and from the government's own members by and large reflect a different economic context. So I think it's important when we talk about this issue to remember the context in which it is found today and compare it to the context of just a few years ago.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Leeds- Grenville has two minutes in response.

**Mr Runciman:** With the encouragement of the Liberal House leader, I want to put something on the record again. Bill 48 is very much part of the Liberal legacy. Despite the fact that the Liberals governed during an economic boom, they increased expenditures at double the annual rate of inflation and paid for this spending binge with 33 tax hikes and a 30% or \$10-billion increase in the provincial debt.

Under the Liberals, the size of the Ontario public service grew from 80,142 in March 1985 to 88,267 in March 1990, and the public service payroll costs, wages and benefits, jumped by 60%, from \$2.7 billion to \$4.4 billion during the Liberals' time in office. I think that speaks for itself.

My colleague from Markham was talking about spending restraint. One of the things the public service employees have talked about is the fact that they witness this phenomenon in government of everyone spending their budgets as we get close to the end of the fiscal year; that every department in government, every ministry, wants to make sure it spends to the last penny what's allocated to it for the fiscal year. They've indicated that if indeed we could institute some measures in respect of that, we could achieve and realize the \$2-billion savings that they're looking for in terms of Bill 48. I don't know. I can't talk to the merits of their argument, but I certainly think it's something worth pursuing.

We're going to consider supporting this legislation on second reading in principle, the principle of restraint. But I have often wondered about the fact that within the senior levels of the bureaucracy there have not been incentives built in for senior civil servants to come in under budget and then determining, based on the level of underexpenditure, some sort of bonus factor which could be built in which would encourage civil servants to come in under budget.

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill 48 because I believe that in the midst of what is a very emotional and difficult situation for the people of

Ontario, and indeed for the government of Ontario, there has to be an examination of how we got here. How on earth did we find ourselves in a situation where provincially our expenditures are rising at an alarming rate and our revenues are in decline? That is the basis of this social contract, the need to manage at a time when demands on provincial resources are at record highs and our revenues are falling away. And manage we will: manage in a fair and sensitive manner so that the health programs Ontarians depend upon, the public education that is the key to an equitable future and the social safety net for the vulnerable and marginalized in our society are all preserved.

We will indeed manage a very difficult situation, at a time when federal Tories have abdicated responsibility, downloaded costs on to the provinces and tabled a do-nothing budget; and despite the Liberal solution in this province, which was to take the easy way out, to call an election in July 1990 and sidestep facing the public when Ontarians were faced with the difficulties of the present.

We'll manage despite the external problems that have brought us to this point, to this place. I'd like to remind the members of this House about the economic policies that have deindustrialized Ontario, deindustrialized this nation, and have caused this debilitating recession: a high Bank of Canada interest rate policy, a high dollar policy, and of course the free trade agreement.

The promise to Canadians of economic prosperity and job creation from FTA deserves a critical re-examination by all of us. When the federal government entered into free trade with the United States, we were promised jobs, training for displaced workers, access to American markets and protection for our social programs. The legacy of the free trade agreement has been less than positive, less than ideal. Supporters of the FTA and its successor, NAFTA, claim that the economic downturn in Canada is the result of a worldwide recession. However, this claim does not explain why the recession started first here and lasted longest here in Canada, why we have the highest unemployment of all industrialized countries—about 10.5% in Canada compared to 7% in the US—and why we lost three times as many jobs in Canada as did the Americans. Of the 300,000 jobs in the manufacturing area lost in Ontario, 45,000 were a direct result of free trade.

Claims that our exports have increased are also suspect. According to Statistics Canada catalogue 65001, 46.4% of Canadian exports to the US consisted of semi-processed materials like wood, pulp and paper, oil and gas, ores and chemicals. That means that the manufacturing processes that required these materials and meant Canadian jobs are now done in the US.

In the first half of 1992, Canada exported \$1 million of equipment to the Americans. We hear about these wonderful exports; we hear about them ad nauseam.

However, those who would hail that statistic forget to say that we imported \$2 million worth of equipment. In 1991, sure, we exported \$3 billion in consumer goods, but we imported over \$16 billion worth.

Since signing the free trade agreement, the Canadian federal government has reduced unemployment insurance benefits by \$1.5 billion, forcing unemployed workers on to provincial welfare rolls, and even stopped funding unemployment insurance at the insistence of the Americans because the US claimed that unemployment insurance was an unfair trade practice.

1920

**Interjection:** Shocking.

**Mrs Mathysen:** Shocking indeed. All this downloading and the loss of the manufacturing base has been devastating. Since 1989, we've lost 25% of our own market to the Americans because we no longer have Canadian content laws.

In 1990, we as the government in Ontario knew that we would have to make up to Ontarians what had happened, that we'd have to put Ontario back on its feet. So in our first budget we injected money into the economy by transferring money above the rate of inflation to our transfer partners and put in place a \$700-million anti-recession fund.

In our second budget, we put in place a job strategy with Jobs Ontario Training, Jobs Ontario Capital, Jobs Ontario Homes and Jobs Ontario Youth, and we borrowed on behalf of municipalities, school boards, colleges and hospitals in order to provide those services.

We've borrowed as much as we can without jeopardizing the future, and now we have to control the deficit because the province's total accumulated debt now stands at \$68 billion. That's \$6,600 for every man, woman and child in Ontario. This past year, the province spent almost as much paying interest on the debt, \$5.4 billion, as it did on education, which was \$5.8 billion.

Ontario is now the largest non-sovereign borrower in the world. About 65% of its money is borrowed outside of Canada. The province spends about 13 cents of every revenue dollar paying interest on the debt. In three years, that would increase to 26 cents if we followed the path we're now on. Interest payments would then be the second-highest area of spending, after health, with all of those interest dollars going out of this province, making someone else the beneficiary.

Ontario's economy would have to grow by over 8% annually for the next three years in order to reduce the 1995-96 budgetary requirements below \$10 billion. In fact, and unfortunately, we expect the growth to average about 3.7% for the next three years, clearly far below that 8% requirement.

That's why we came up with the idea of the social contract. Our aim is to work with employers such as

municipalities and their unions to develop approaches that will lower the costs of the broader public sector while preserving services and protecting jobs.

A week ago we introduced legislation, and that was a very difficult decision, there is no question. But that legislation encourages representatives of sectors in the public service, such as hospitals, school boards, municipalities and colleges, to sit down and to bargain agreements on reducing costs. These agreements will have to meet targets for cost savings in specific sectors while minimizing job loss, will have to exempt workers who earn less than \$30,000, must guarantee that pay equity will not be affected, and provide workers with retraining-redeployment if they are laid off, in addition to a \$30-million job security fund. Agreements can also include clauses on openness and accountability, alternative work arrangements, joint worker-employer committees, pension savings and, importantly, joint trusteeship of pensions.

It's a sharing of responsibility, it's a sharing of decision-making between employers and employees, and it's an empowering thing. It's the kind of thing that's never been attempted here in the province before, and I think ultimately it will benefit all who participate.

Finally, and most of all, this is an attempt to manage, to manage a situation from which we cannot run, a situation that has caused great pain but will be managed because we are the government. The people of Ontario are depending upon us. We will deal fairly with workers. They are depending on us, and we will not let any of them down.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I was struck by the last comment of the speaker, that they were going to manage the economy. I wonder where this member was during the first budget when we had to do everything in this Legislature. We had to stand up, had days where we tried to protest that budget. This government was going to spend its way out, it said. I remember looking across at the flocks on the other side when we said: "You can't do it. Every other province, every other jurisdiction of every other political stripe is cutting back. Don't do it." What did this government do? They came in with a 5.6% increase to the civil servants and they increased the number of civil servants so the bottom line went up 13.5%.

Where was this speech then, I say to the member? Where was this speech on the budget then when we told you: "Don't do it. You can't continue to tax, spend and borrow like there is no tomorrow"? This member across sat silent and said nothing. She said nothing until she was told by her Finance minister and her Premier that it was time to stand up and reel off the lines.

The per-person deficit, going way back, was almost as bad a couple of years ago. Where were you then, talking about the \$7,300 for every man, woman and child? You, my friends, have doubled it in the time you



have been in office—doubled it. Now you're worried when it's \$7,300. Where were you two years ago when we told you, "You can't do it"? We went across this province with public hearings. We said, "You can't do it." What did we hear from this side? They were going to spend their way out.

For this member to stand up and talk about the free trade agreement at a time when her government is laying off nurses, doctors, teachers, is scaling back salaries—it's typical socialist ideology to blame somebody else. It's always somebody else's fault. When they were in opposition, it was always somebody else's fault. Now they are in government, it's always some other level: It's the nurses' fault, it's the teachers' fault, it's the municipalities' fault. Where were you a year and a half ago when we were standing up for the same people you're pretending that you're standing up for today? Quite frankly, that's why people are cynical about politicians, because of the speech we just heard from that member.

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I want to compliment my colleague for her comments today, because she talked about a number of issues. I know she wanted to mention the good work the CAW is doing with the tombstones that have been travelling the province around the Tory policies that have been implemented and their effects, why in 1990 and 1991 and in this budget we had to present budgets to help workers. The member for Middlesex also indicated about Jobs Ontario. The Liberals refuse to even acknowledge Jobs Ontario now, but they were in my riding where Jobs Ontario is working very well for those people who have been on social assistance without UI. That was caused by that party's fathers in Ottawa, and it's called free trade, which has had a devastating effect. We talk about training, which we have done, and the benefits that have been there.

I notice the opposition does a lot of talking about what was going on then. There were good economic times; they didn't have to battle free trade. I know when the election was called, they said "We are doing it the democratic way." Yes, doing it the democratic way so they wouldn't have to go in 1992 before the electorate to deal with the difficult situations that were here.

The member for Middlesex raised a number of good issues that were very important, and very important to my community. I heard Mr Bradley talk about the concerns he faced as the Minister of the Environment. We're still faced with those issues in our community today. In the budget around the capital initiatives, a community like Dover township is just waiting for water to be provided to that community, so it can provide economic growth. In Mitchell's Bay, they're waiting for that tower. Those were things that were there a long time ago because we were having wells blocked. The people in Bothwell were waiting for that

economic growth and providing water for that community.

The Minister of Transportation has made sure that community is dealing with the health and safety issues around garages in two of my communities; a very positive statement. So I thank the member and compliment her.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I listened with some interest to the member, who spoke as if she really believed what she was reading. I guess it came out of the back room, but that's fine. That's probably what bothered me more than anything. That's what bothered me more than anything.

**Mr Cousens:** Oh, come on. You shouldn't knock that. It was well read.

**Mr Mahoney:** It was well read, I agree. I didn't say it wasn't.

I say to the member from the Conservative Party, we hear the response from the Conservatives, who say, "These guys do nothing but blame everyone else." Every time one of the members of the Tories stand up, they forget conveniently about 15 consecutive years of deficits run by former Tory regimes. It's great to have a convenient memory at a time when perhaps that kind of spending was more than just a little bit irresponsible. Frankly, there's probably enough blame to go around this entire place for some of the troubles.

#### 1930

What we should be trying to do is talk about this legislation and what we think is wrong specifically with the legislation. Talking about the 12 days off right in the legislation, and I didn't hear the member for Middlesex talk about this, it says that anyone who is designated as having a critical job—and who might that be: fire departments, police departments, simply employees of other levels of government?—anyone who has a job designated as critical will be able to bank those 12 days off and take them back in the form of holidays just like sick pay, and that's going to happen in 1996 when this social contract and this government will have expired. That is going to create an absolute catastrophe for the province.

I don't hear anybody over there talking about the reality of 1996, the reality that the taxpayers in 1996 are going to be facing a catastrophe. Talk about the bill. Forget about the stuff you did in your first budget when you made a terrible mess, and talk about what you're doing today.

**Mr Cousens:** The revisionist historian from the Liberals has just spoken. I suppose if you could rewrite history, his Liberals would do it.

What I'd like the New Democrats to consider, as they're participating in this debate—and it is refreshing that one of the honourable members from the New Democrats will at least stand up and put something on

the record; I think you are to be given credit for that. But I wish you would also start facing up to, as I give you the opportunity now, the waste that's gone on within government. How can your government continue to proceed with the building of the workers' compensation structure, this new edifice, head office in downtown Toronto, for \$185 million? There's \$185 million that could be identified right now. That process could be stopped. You wouldn't save it all because of the property costs and the other parts of it, but that's a cost item I'd like to see you somehow come to grips with.

Then you, as a party, have spent government moneys to the extent of over \$300,000 fighting NAFTA. I understand how upset you are with the North American free trade agreement, but it's a federal issue, and the fact that the New Democrats have spent provincial money to that extent on this again causes me to ask you, why don't you start addressing your own government waste?

We have brought to the attention of the government and the Provincial Auditor has pointed out that the social assistance program in the province of Ontario is out by at least 10%; 10% of the moneys being spent on social assistance is being wasted, fraudulent. That amounts to over \$620 million. Why don't you as a government look at saving some of that \$620 million and applying that to the deficit and applying that to a new form of efficiency in government?

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Middlesex has two minutes in response.

**Mrs Mathysen:** I'd like to begin by saying that I'd be very happy to give the member for Mississauga West a lesson in speechwriting if he's so enamoured with my ability to write speeches.

To the member from Oakville, I say to you that the spending this government did in its first and second budgets was responsible spending. It was intended to put the province back on its feet at a time when federal Tories had deliberately abandoned us. Remember the \$4.5 billion in transfer payments and how desperately those are needed in this province in order to meet our obligations.

That money in those first two budgets was directed into anti-recession funds, into Jobs Ontario Capital, Jobs Ontario Homes, Jobs Ontario Youth, in the infrastructure we will need to build this province, the infrastructure we will need to be strong in the future, because strong we will be in 1996 when this government is re-elected.

The recovery that's been talked about, that I mentioned, will be about 3.7% this year, next year, the year after. It's a very fragile recovery. We have to protect it, and the only way that we can protect it is by ensuring that our interest payments are not in excess of what we can afford. We have to reduce our deficit, plain and simple.

I thank the member for Markham for his remarks, but I would like to remind him that this government reduced its own spending by \$4 billion this year and by \$4 billion last year. We know we cannot build a future on sand. We'll build it on responsible spending, responsible saving and by managing, and manage we will.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** I really appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill. I'll try my best to be as calm as possible through this 30 minutes of time which they've given me to do this. I think the best way I can be calm is to just remind the House what we are debating. Bill 48 is an act to encourage negotiated—oh?—settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the government's expenditure reduction program.

**Mr Elston:** Is there anything in the standing orders about misleading titles?

**Mr Curling:** I couldn't believe the bill talked about negotiated settlements, and they're going to do that through a term called "social contract." That's one of the terms.

First, I want to say to you and my colleagues in the government that we do acknowledge that the province of Ontario is in a deficit position. We all know that. We know how it got there, too, as a matter of fact. I don't want to sound the trumpet and play the harp for the Liberals, but as you know, Mr Speaker, as you were here at the time, and quite a few of the members here—not many of the government members; they were watching from the sidelines, seeing us balance the budget twice.

This was quite an achievement because previous to that the budget was never balanced in this province for decades and decades. That is quite an accomplishment. I think what it is saying to the people out there is that whatever we collect in revenue we shall spend; not that we will spend more than what we collect. We did it twice.

Here comes now a new government that came in and we have found that we are in a deficit position, severely so. As a matter of fact, they got obsessed with it to the state that they even got nervous enough to say it would be \$17 billion. On this side, we said to that government: "We don't think it'll be \$17 billion. Stop behaving what it will be." I remember my colleague from Scarborough-Agincourt pointed out to them, "How do you intend to get \$17 billion?" They said, "Oh, no, we're going to get to \$17 billion." They wouldn't even deal with the fact that there was about an \$11-billion deficit to be dealt with. They start dealing with \$17 billion.

So here they went about, "We should be able to do something about that." But before that, as many of the colleagues here brought to the attention of the members earlier, when the socialist government, the New Demo-



cratic Party, came into power, it felt here was an opportunity to pay off and pay its way out of this debt it presumes the Liberals left them, and we said, "That's not the way you do things." If you consider that a recession is coming and that we have to deal with it, you don't spend your way out of a recession.

To bring you back home—many of you have run your homes, of course—if you find that with the income you're getting in, you can't pay your hydro bill and you can't pay your grocery bills and things are getting worse, you don't go out and buy more groceries and run up your debts, because the income is less.

1940

But they had a lot of friends they promised faithfully, "If you let us win this election, we'll pay you off." So we find ourselves today in a vicious deficit position, and we members in this House—I said I'd be calm—are prepared to get this government out of this terrible deficit position. The reason: It comes home to roost, because you and I will be paying for that, and your children will be paying for this. So we have to hope they'll be listening very attentively and taking our suggestions. Stop pointing your fingers and saying it was the Tories in Ottawa who did it or the Liberals who did it, but take a constructive way to reduce that wanton spending you went on, on a freebie there.

Remember that accord? I went across to my colleagues over there and tried to ask them if they had a copy of the accord. Some didn't know of the accord, the famous accord; couldn't remember it, had never seen it. I was really shocked. At that time, in 1985, I had just arrived in this House and all I heard was the accord, all the good things, and we heard that we should spend money on programs that were necessary, that were neglected by previous governments and here is the opportunity. The only time we have a responsible government in this province, they said, is when we have a minority government. The NDP said it had an opportunity to bring the Liberal government to its senses by signing the accord.

Not one time did I ever heard them say that on the programs we had in place, we should spend less. I heard them say we should spend more on housing. I heard that we should spend more on day care. We heard on all these accord things, "We will spend more," and sometimes we heard, "Too little, too late." When the programs were successful, they stood in the House and said: "If it weren't for that accord, we wouldn't be here today. People would be on the street, no housing." They were saying that needed social programs would not have been funded efficiently.

My golly, they didn't remember the accord. I just walked over there. Not one remembered the accord of that time. It was a program which they were so very proud of.

I don't even want to bring you to the Agenda for

People, because that's taking us back a little further. Mr Speaker, you remember the agenda: what should be done, promises; the conscience of the people, the socialist government, the NDP. People would say: "I am so glad they're there. They are the conscience of government." My golly, upon winning, they have lost that kind of conscience itself.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: There is an absence of quorum in the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is there a quorum present?

**Acting Table Clerk (Mr Franco Carrozza):** Mr Speaker, a quorum is not present.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum now is present. The honourable member for Scarborough North may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Curling:** I am appalled to know that this serious matter we're debating today concerns the people of the province of Ontario but that the government itself can't even be present to participate. But I will continue, and I hope they'll get an opportunity to read the Hansard. I think it's important, because I'm not speaking for myself; I'm speaking specifically on behalf of the people of Scarborough North and also for many of the concerned citizens of this province who feel their province has gone into the hands of people who are so irresponsible.

I want to leave you with one thing, another matter I would like to raise before I really get into the social contract. I want to tell you at the outset that I don't really care about the bickering that is going on between the executive body of the NDP, and I don't even really care about the unions and you trying to cut the deal quietly, silently or what it would be. I really don't care. When they were at their retreat on the last weekend to decide whether the executive body supports Uncle Bobby Rae, I really didn't care, because the fact of their coming out smiling with a few of his selective group of people who say, "I have won the day," didn't say a thing to those people who were losing jobs, who are threatened with bankruptcy, who have been bankrupt, who have seen this irresponsible government go on its way and find these people today uncertain of their future. I really don't care.

What I do care about, as I said, is the destruction and the disillusionment of our seniors, who today are not quite sure if they will have a health care plan that will see them through their days. What I care about is our youth, who aren't quite sure, having done the things that they were asked to do and encouraged to do to get an education, who say, "I now have the skills or the education and can't get a job." As I said, I don't care if those union bosses and the NDP executive don't like Bobby's smile or if they like his smile. But I'm telling

you that our young people are in danger, are so disillusioned by the direction of where this government is going. The fact is, they don't interpret it that way. How they interpret it is, can they get a job? Then here comes the brag, Jokes Ontario—I mean, Jobs Ontario. The thing has become a joke.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** It's not a joke.

**Mr Curling:** If you don't think it's a joke, I tell you that on Friday I was in my constituency office and I had a call from an individual who was running a business and decided to employ 12 people under Jobs Ontario. When he called the broker office, or whatever they call that group, the number was no longer in service. No notice. Jokes Ontario. He was wondering if the joke was on him. I said to him, "Phone the head office and find out what happened." We phoned and they got through. They don't know why that Jokes—Jobs Ontario office was closed down. They come every day and brag about jobs that have been delivered to people, because this is the way of recovery.

I'm more concerned about that. I'm much more concerned also about those young people who were promised that their tuition fees would be reduced when they go up and they would get a good OSAP grant and loan. Then the same government here took away the grants from those students, reduced the loans.

**Mr Martin:** No, we didn't. We didn't take away the grants.

**Mr Curling:** If you don't know they took away the grants, go back and read your program. They took away the grant portion of the OSAP program and gave the loans and spread the loans and then bragged that there are more students getting loans. Sure there are. But they're getting less.

**Mr Martin:** No, they're not. It's \$500 million this year.

**Mr Curling:** No one student is getting \$500 million, as this individual thinks. When you spread it over more, your math will tell you that they got less. Those students aren't able to go back to school because they have to find more money for tuition fees. Then you talk about a social contract. You're talking about the disillusioned youth in our society today, who have no faith in you, who felt—

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** They even took their Ontario scholarships away from them.

**Mr Curling:** As my colleague from Quinte said, they took away the Ontario scholarship program. I'll tell you, they're saying, "What is my future then if this government continues to make all these promises, make all these fancy things about social contract?" They can't even go back to school.

Some who would not like to go back to school at this time, at this juncture, would have liked to work, would have liked to more or less get a job now, to contribute

to this society. No jobs.

Of course, it's not only this government that caused the recession. The economic times have done all of that. We saw it coming as a Liberal government and thought that we should go to the people and ask them, really to say, "We have to change our strategy of what is happening." We were going to go the people in a democratic way and do that. The people said to them that, "I think that we gave you five years to govern, the maximum, and you should govern," and we said, in a democratic way, "We'll ask the people." They said, "Here are some people who made some wonderful promises about school tuition fees, OSAP and what have you, and jobs, so I will give them a chance to govern." What do they do? They're trying to renegotiate again.

1950

Go to the polls if you have the guts and ask the people if we are in the right direction, and then you will find out. If you really want to have a social contract, ask the people of the province through an election if you have a social contract. Ask those young people who will be voting for the first time.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Order, please.

**Mr Curling:** Ask those people. You're running and hiding now.

**The Acting Speaker:** I want to remind the honourable member to address the Chair, and interjections are out of order.

**Mr Curling:** I am, Mr Speaker. Ask them for me, then, if they feel they're not running and hiding while they should be doing that. Ask those people, the young people, should we give them another tenure? They are not dumb. The dictatorial attitude of this party is telling you that, "We will negotiate, circumvent the democratic process." But I tell you, the people are waiting for you and the young people are waiting. If it takes you one year, if it takes you two years, when they get you, they're going to make sure they give you that message, just like they're going to give the message to those Tories in Ottawa because of the way they're pork-barrelling and the way they've treated this country and this province. They won't forget, because they're intelligent people, the working people.

This government, the NDP government, as soon as they came in, do you know what they did? They lowered the level at which they could tax people and then taxed those poor people, gave them a great increase of taxes, and said, "Now you are earning a lot, we'll tax you more," because they dropped the level on which they could put income tax. On the backs of the poor; that's what they did. People were struggling at a difficult time, losing their houses, losing their jobs. They were taxing them more and turning around and



saying that we had taxed 33 times. But we balanced the budget in that time. What did they do? Taxed and gave away and talked about \$17 billion in deficit, which truly, as you know, is about \$11.7 billion in deficit. I say to them that they should stop blaming other governments and let's get down and work.

This social contract will not work. Imagine, a socialist government is going to go back and tamper with collective bargaining agreements. I recall when I was here in 1986, I think, when the TTC was on strike and people were concerned that the disabled might not get the buses and people couldn't go to work. We were contemplating what we should do: How long should the strike continue? We got threats over there that if you touch that collective bargaining agreement and force people back to work, that's not the way you go. You sit down and you negotiate settlements. That's what the bill says, their bill. And you try to preserve jobs; you don't get rid of jobs.

Lo and behold, here is this government coming in now, the socialist government which is going to go and tamper with 9,000 contracts that people have worked so hard for over the years and negotiated at bargaining tables, all of them. You know what is so ironic about it, Mr Speaker? I think about 50% of those socialists over there, the comrades who are sitting at many of those tables, are ministers they begged, they beseeched to participate in the 1990 election because they couldn't get people to run. They said, "Listen. We can't win, really, but we need to put people together. We need people to run so we don't look too bad as a party." Guess what, Mr Speaker? They got elected.

They remind me so much of the dog who chased the car down the highway: The car stopped and the dog didn't know what to do with it. They ran in an election and they won, and they don't know what to do with the province; with the amount of money they collect for revenue, they don't know what to do; even try to go back and interfere with collective bargaining agreements and say, "After we have spent it all, we want it back."

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** What was the end of that story?

**Mr Curling:** Since the member didn't get it, Mr Speaker, maybe I should, as you said, speak through you. He said, "What happened to the dog and the car?" and he didn't get the message: He didn't know what to do with it. Mr Speaker, could you ask him to see me after the speech and I'll explain it to him.

Of course I am also concerned about the shortfall in transfer payments to the municipalities. That's what I'm concerned about. I'm not concerned about you having a retreat and getting popularity contests, whether Bob Rae's popular still with his party. Not at all. I am concerned about Scarborough, the municipality or the city of Scarborough, not getting the proper transfer payments.

Take for example, over the next two years the municipality will have to come up with as much as \$18 million to cover recent provincial cutbacks, stemming from, of course, this so-called social contract with a gun at each head to say, "If you don't"—what do they call it? Failsafe. "If you don't, we'll do this. Jump or I will push," and if I want to explain that again to you, put them at the precipice and say, "Jump or I will push." Eighteen-million-dollar shortfall, and in order, Mr Speaker, to cover the anticipated shortfall, do you know how many jobs will be lost in Scarborough? Two hundred and fifty jobs will have to be cut.

A few ministers are here and I'm so happy they're here. So when you get back to the cabinet table, I want you to know that—or just drive around Scarborough and see the amount of businesses that have been folding and have been bankrupt. Bankruptcy itself has caused people to lose jobs.

**Mr Wood:** The Liberals like taxes.

**Mr Curling:** Again he blames the Liberals. I'm saying the reality is, bankruptcies caused people to be out of jobs, and then you took away \$18 million of transfer payments to the municipality and that will lose a further 250 jobs.

It will also add to the city's share of the property tax, of course, 9% more to the property tax. And that same government that flip-flopped all the time when it had market value assessment, at one minute yes—because many people in Scarborough are concerned about excessive property tax and want a fair market value assessment. They stalled. They said yes; they got to the door, they said no. And I'm sure my colleague from Markham, who's right allergic to the government and its spending, as you can hear him in the background here, Mr Speaker—but I tell you, this government had flip-flopped and, because of its indecision and indecisiveness, had cost money and jobs to the city. The only good news about all this is that there's a time limit to how long the people will tolerate this government. The government itself will expire in another two years and that's the beautiful thing about democracy. You could play your game wherever you want.

**2000**

I want to just add to the fact, when I talk about the municipal taxes, what it does to individuals, because many times when we speak about things we talk about big numbers and it's lost to the individual. That's what I talk about in the additional property tax. It will translate to an additional \$60 to the city's portion of the tax bill to an average assessed value of \$6,000. That is a concern. Every increase to pay out is extremely difficult for any individual when people are losing jobs.

They are concerned out there. If the government should listen, I think it could learn a lot in that process. I don't think they want to listen. Bob Rae is focused on one agenda and he's going to go there whether the

whole ship is going down or not. It is unfortunate. Even his own members, his own diehard supporters, those who not only support him in principle but also support him in funds, are coming apart. In his own caucus the wheels are falling off, members are jumping ship, giving up partial rides on what they're having on this wagon of doom that they're going to in wrecking this province. In the meantime, extremely concerned we are.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Curling:** You see, there they are. They are concerned. They are extremely, extremely concerned that they don't even follow their leader any more. You see?

You know, it's peculiar. I have to mention this, the fact is when the government talks about its restraint policy and reducing ministries because of cost itself, the addition itself over there was remarkable. They got more ministers but they said they have reduced; more costs.

The fact is, one of the concerns I have especially is the Minister of Education and Training, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, the Minister of Skills Development. When we need mostly a minister to concentrate on training and retraining, we find that this minister will be too busy to focus on that direction.

Training itself is extremely important at this stage, because more people are unemployed and the age group that has been unemployed, many are over 40, which I find is rather difficult to get jobs, and the government here has done little about the training process. They talk a lot about it, of course, talk extremely a lot about how we're going to train people, and we haven't seen any great results on this.

I remember too, and you'll recall, which is coming up shortly, and I would have a moment to debate that maybe tomorrow if they dare bring in the employment equity time for reading, that the internship program of employment for minorities and employment equity that they are so committed to they have cancelled. The minister was here a minute. Maybe he stepped out for a bite, as usual, or a sleep. The fact is they had cancelled that program. People were finding it more difficult for the workplace at a time when they can't get jobs and their rhetoric doesn't even match their act.

I'm extremely concerned that this party's in a popularity contest with its own membership, and the people there who are in need are not getting those needs addressed. The seniors and their medical programs, as I said, are wondering what's happening. You saw just in this last weekend one of the hospitals in Toronto close its emergency section, and the impact it had on the other hospitals was tremendous. It's a signal to tell you that there are needs, and they closed that emergency department because they said they had no doctors to monitor that.

Who suffers? Is it the doctor? No. Is it a member over at the government? No. It's the people who need those services. You just can't go around cutting programs the way you see and feel that it has no impact. The impact is there.

A young lady came to me on Friday. She's 23. She got her honours at York University and she said to me that she wants a job. She's feeling so disillusioned she feels she should go to the United States and she's asking me what part of the United States I think will take her, because it doesn't seem that the government or anyone is interested for her, to contribute for her training and her education here. It's a loss of vision, a loss of hope.

We as legislators, we as parliamentarians must keep that hope alive. We must make concrete strategies and put proper programs in place so that those young people out there will feel that even through tough times they can hang in there and there is hope for them.

In conclusion, let me appeal to all out there not to give up, because I feel that we live in a great province, a province of people who are concerned. I think this government is concerned, extremely misguided, out of focus, but we hope that with some of this debate in the House it will come to its senses and see that people are hurting.

Their overexpenditure in housing, the at times out-of-focus way in which they have done things—I feel that if you can tell people that it is managed properly, that it is fiscally responsible, that we don't intend to expend all this amount of money wantonly, they will listen as much as they listen after when we tell them you can't spend your way out of a recession, they will find their way on the road of recovery, because I think every single member in this House is willing to see this province return to the kind of economic stability it had and the hope that it had that we can give hope to our young, to our old and to all our citizens in this great province of ours.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Questions and comments? The member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** In listening to the honourable member from Scarborough, it raises the question as to what the status symbol of the 1990s will be. I think the status symbol of the 1990s is a job. If there's anything that we can do in government, in opposition or in power to help find jobs for people, then that really has to be one of our major objectives.

The fact that the member was able to spend some time on that subject goes into his whole background as a former lecturer or professor at Seneca College. I think the sensitivity that we all have to have to this subject is something that is all part of the environment that's created for business that the government can create.

Unfortunately, this government has made it extremely



difficult for business to want to establish, advance their business, build upon it, expand or do anything here in this province, because when the private sector is strong, then through that private sector jobs will be created for young, middle-aged and old alike. It will give them opportunity to participate in the business environment. Not all jobs are with the public sector. We've got to find ways so that the private sector can expand and grow.

To the extent that the member touches upon this, I appreciate that he is correct. I also agree that it's a tragedy that's taking place here in Ontario now, that in fact the confidence level of the business sector is going down to such a degree that there are fewer jobs, there's less investment and there's less opportunity. You see that in the young people who are searching for a chance to get started, you see that in every age group.

The challenge then goes back to this government. Look for ways to give encouragement to business. Look for ways to give long-term incentives, not just the short-term solutions that they're looking at now, but may there be something like reversing Bill 40, the labour legislation that the government brought in. I mean, the Liberals aren't on record as to replacing that. That would be a good start for the Liberals to come and say that they're going to something specific with regard to these punitive, terrible methods.

**Mr Mahoney:** I want to congratulate the member from Scarborough because he really, I think, hit on some very salient points, particularly with regard to our young people.

Today I listened to a radio show earlier this morning on a local station out of Toronto where they had young people phoning in talking about how they had left school, why they had left school and what their prospects were. It was really very depressing being the father of three young men who are now going out. One of them finished university and looking for work, another going back for a third final year perhaps and another one coming along and saying, "What is my future?"

**2010**

I think what the member spoke to is exactly what is wrong with this particular legislation and the direction this government's showing. In fact, the young people are saying that there's nothing to stimulate the economy; there's nothing.

The member from the Conservative Party talked about Bill 40, which has totally eroded the confidence in the business sector, and you talk about trickle-down economics. The trickle-down impact of the negative legislation being brought in by the NDP is really very catastrophic, and the biggest difficulty is that, frankly, most of us will likely survive one way or another, but it's the young people in their early 20s, in their late teens, who are going out into the workforce, who are

going back to university because they can't possibly get a job, who, as was pointed out by the member, are receiving less assistance by this government to go back to university, increasing the standards to get into university, which then, in a trickle-down effect, also increases the standards to get into community colleges and it takes away the options of all our young people.

If there's one legacy that this government is going to leave to this province, aside from the massive debt, it will be a lost generation of young people who simply have very little hope and very little future.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** I too listened intently, as always, when the member opposite, Mr Curling, the member for Scarborough North, availed himself of the opportunity to address the assembly. I've learned over the few short years that I've had the privilege, the honour of serving, to look for an analysis, to look for the focus and to look perhaps beyond for alternatives. When all is said and done, the sentiment that was expressed was one of—

**Mr Mahoney:** More is said than done.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** I'm referring to the remarks and so on. I make the same mistake in five languages, Mr Mahoney. I wish you so well.

When all has been consumed and when you look for the alternative, who is going to pay for all this? No one on this side of the House—I want to remind the member, with respect—likes doing less for people, but in order to save the core of the system, you have to make some difficult choices.

The member, with respect, should have mentioned that we did not shy away from the opportunity under these difficult times—not impossible times but difficult times—to make the tough decisions. We could have bypassed our friends. We could have said, no, the collective agreement will cease to exist. We didn't do this. We are sharing the responsibility so the very same people who the member wishes to protect will indeed, yes, see the future, short term and long term, with more and more confidence; not the other way around.

The member, with respect, should keep in mind that you never lose by being positive, that if the role of the opposition is to disagree, so be it. By the same token, there is the responsibility during difficult times to share with us and to say and to find what is good about the alternative that we are proposing.

**Mr Murphy:** I want to join in the universal approval of the remarks from the member for Scarborough North who is, as usual, eloquent as always, although I would want to add briefly to his remarks. I'm sure he won't mind when I make a few comments about the Conservative position on the social contract.

As we know, the leader of that party has said, "Bang, bang, bang"; that would be the approval of the bill on first and second reading. Well, I think the T.S. Eliot poem, *The Waste Land*, is a more accurate description

of their policy, where he says it ends not with a bang but with a whimper, because we've heard one day Mr Harris saying he's in favour of it, the next day he isn't in favour of it. On April 14, he starts off in favour of social contract legislation. On April 28—

**Mr Cousens:** I don't think you got it right at all. Get the facts right if you're going to quote somebody. Quote him accurately.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The member for Markham, you had your turn. It's his turn.

**Mr Murphy:** Mr Speaker, they advised me when I came into this House that I should be careful not to feed the animals and that was obviously good advice.

On April 28, the leader of the third party said, "Bang, bang, bang; first, second reading." Then later, on June 7, he said, "No legislation is even required." Two days later, he wants the legislation back on. Five days later, he says, "No, I don't want the legislation." Well, we're concerned, and we're trying to figure out where exactly that party stands. I hear that maybe they'll vote on second reading but not in favour on third reading. Well, I think we've taken a clear position, and I'm glad to see that the member for Markham shares in our concern.

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Honourable members in this House are directed by the Speaker to respond to the speech that has been delivered. The dissertation that's been given by the member for St George-St David had nothing to do with the speech that was given by the honourable member. I therefore would say that his remarks were totally out of order.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. It is the responsibility of the Speaker, of course, to notice if he was out of order, and I do not consider him out of order.

The member for Scarborough North, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr Curling:** The member from Nipigon asked me to try to find a positive thing about the social contract, and I did search it. The only positive thing is I feel that it is important, of course, to look at what we have in the expenditures and see if we can curtail it.

Then I looked a little deeper and the social contract—I have to go back to some rather negative things it's going to do. One of the things it's going to do is take away the equity gains that all three parties have fought so hard for, the Conservatives, the Liberals and the NDP, and many of the equity gains they have done. People who are going to be hurt by all this will be women, visible minorities, the disabled. I'll tell you, when the layoff comes, most of the time those are the first people to go because they have not moved up in the ranks properly. It's going to hurt them.

I would appeal to this government: It's going to hurt the young people. It is extremely important that we make sure that they are not disillusioned about all of

this. The member from Nipigon also stated that it is short-term, maybe, pain for long-term gain. I think he has it all mixed up. It's a long-term pain because they postpone that payment in many ways, especially with the leave arrangement that they want to do. When people ask for payback in two or three years down the road, this government may be long gone, but the costs on the young people will be there, and they will wonder: "Why is this burden upon me? I didn't create it."

So while you're looking for positive things in this bill, I'm saying to you, listen carefully. You can redirect your pain somewhere else, but not on the backs of the poor, the young, the disabled and the seniors.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I'm not going to rise to add to the universal approval of the speech from the member for Scarborough North, although I have a great deal of respect for the member for Scarborough North.

Nevertheless, I was very taken by his analogy of the dog chasing the car, and the car stopped. The dog was a member of the government, I guess, and caught the car, and it didn't know what to do with the car. But it occurred to me, when the member of Scarborough North was creating this analogy, that in this race, the Liberal dog had been out ahead in that race. When that race started, the Liberal dog was well ahead of the dog from the government. I wondered, in my own mind, what happened to that particular dog. I guess we can only hope it got a decent burial. But I can tell you that the Progressive Conservative dog is still running in that race, and we're going to catch that car next, in the next election. It's going to be the Progressive Conservative that's going to catch that car.

I would like to speak largely from the perspective of municipalities and the impact of the social contract with regard to the municipalities. One of the speakers previously tonight indicated at some great length as to the fine job that the civil servants were doing in the various sectors. I can speak from firsthand experience, having worked within the municipalities. I know full well the excellent work that the people in the municipalities do: the people in the building departments, the people collecting the garbage, the firefighters, and on and on. They do a tremendous amount of good work.

2020

I can speak from experience with the people in the hospital sector, being a member of the Toronto East General Foundation, and having spent some time in a hospital myself not too long ago, I can tell you the excellent work that the hospital workers do. Having a daughter in the education system, I know just what a tremendous job the teachers do under some very trying conditions in this day and age.

I guess the point is that they do a wonderful job, the workers, but we have another problem to address. We have a problem to address of spending. Through the



whole public sector, unfortunately, the spending has gone beyond our means, and this has to be addressed. Notwithstanding the wonderful job that's being done at all levels of government by various employees, we are simply spending too much money.

In the fiscal year of 1992, we brought in revenues through the province of Ontario of \$42 billion and we spent \$54 billion. Now, members of the general public will know what happens in their own budget if they have a salary of \$42,000 and they spend \$54,000. It doesn't work. You might get away with that for a short period of time, but in the long run you've got a problem and it has to be addressed.

This government should have addressed that problem a couple of years ago. They've waited too long. They should have addressed it at least in 1991, but at least at the present time it's somewhat heartening to see that the problem is attempting to be addressed.

I heard comments earlier this evening, "What about the Progressive Conservatives? What about 15 years of deficits that the Progressive Conservatives ran up?" We can spread the blame. We can look at who should be blamed, but I'll tell you, the general public doesn't look at it that way. Yes, the Progressive Conservatives ran up deficits and yes, they ran up a debt of some \$30 billion, I guess, in this province of Ontario.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** Since Confederation.

**Mr David Johnson:** Since Confederation. Since the start of Confederation. It was a debt that was controllable. They were deficits that were controllable. The Liberals ran up deficits in all but one year. Yes, they balanced the budget one year, but during a period of tremendous revenue growth they ran up the debt from \$30 billion to about \$50 billion in five short years, almost doubling the debt. Almost doubling the debt, as the member across the way says.

Now the NDP have taken over and in two or three short years the debt has climbed to where it will be by the end of this fiscal year to, at best, \$78 billion; another \$28 billion that's been added on. But I don't really think that the general public wants to hear about that. They want to hear about what we are going to do now. We are here today. This is not 1975, this is not 1985, this is 1993. What are we prepared to do about this awful situation, this tremendous mortgage on the future of our families in the future?

I can tell you that the municipalities have been prepared to go to battle on this issue, and the municipalities, I suppose somewhat equivalent to the hospitals and the school boards, are foot soldiers in this war. They are people that didn't cause this war. They are people that have looked after their own turf and their own territory and managed well, but they are being called upon to go to battle in this war for the deficit of

the province, and they are prepared to go to war. They're just hoping that when they go to war, they'll be given the proper weapons to fight the war, and up to this point they haven't been.

Now I can tell you the municipalities have gone to war over the past couple of years. They didn't wait till 1993 to recognize this problem. The municipalities, at least two years ago and many before that, had started to pare down. The municipalities have been fighting the battle of the budget by implementing planning. This is a word that I wish was more in vogue here in the province of Ontario, "planning," planning ahead.

They start their process in about September of one year for their budget of the next year. They go through a period of consultations, they go through cuts, they go through scrutiny on the budget and they bring forward a budget that is very responsible. Over the past couple of years they've implemented measures such as flat-lining, where a department has only been given one year what it received the next year.

I was interested in that regard to hear the comments of the member for St Catharines. The member for St Catharines was a cabinet minister back a couple of years ago and he related to us this evening that not once during the period of time when he was a cabinet minister did he hear any comment from any of the government members other than they wanted more spending. He said the NDP came to him and wanted more spending. The Tories came to him and wanted more spending. I presume his own members, the Liberals, came to him and wanted more spending.

That is exactly the same as what happens at the municipal level, and the municipalities have had to learn the word "no." It's a very special word. It helps to keep budgets in order, the word "no." I've had to say no. I've had deputations in front of me at the regional level and at the local level asking for more and more money, more and more spending. I wonder if the member for St Catharines was able to say no. From his comments and from the record of spending during that period of time, I think the answer is that he was not able; he didn't. Is that the answer? He didn't say no. The spending went up. The spending went double digits.

So that's what has to happen. Municipalities are looking at other ways to pare their budgets. They're looking at contracting out where there can be savings made in contracting out. They're looking at days off with no pay, and they're doing this and they're keeping their budgets in order.

Now they have also set their budgets for 1993. They went through this process, they've set their budgets, and because we seem to have such a lack of planning here at the provincial government, they weren't told the proper amount of money that they would have to deal with in 1993. They had every right to believe that they would have a certain level of provincial grants. Indeed

they were informed that they would have a certain level of provincial grants.

Then well into their year that information changed and they were told: "Sorry. You went through your whole process, you did all your planning, you've set forward a budget. Many of you sent out tax bills. That's too bad because you're not going to get the money we told you you were going to get. Indeed, you're going to be cut back because of a program we'll call the expenditure control program. Mississauga, you're going to be cut back over \$1 million because of the expenditure control program."

I just wonder if the people of Ontario know the amount of money that some of the municipalities are being cut back. Brantford, Ontario, is going to be cut back \$1,200,000 because of this program; St Thomas, over half a million dollars; Windsor, over \$3 million Windsor's going to be cut back because of that program; Owen Sound, over \$300,000 Owen Sound is going to be cut back because of the expenditure control program, moneys they believed they had when they set their budget.

But the municipalities, to their credit, did not complain. It wasn't fair, but they said: "Yes, we understand. We understand that spending has to be cut. We understand that the deficit can't continue to grow, that the debt can't continue to grow. We understand that, so we're going to help." They recognize that the public understood that, and I might say that the Progressive Conservatives understand that, that spending has to be cut. Only the Liberals, for some reason, don't seem to recognize that spending has to be cut and they carry on criticizing spending cuts.

Then came the second leg of the spending cuts, the social contract. Again, I think that we all recognize that spending had to be cut still more. We had a \$17-billion deficit. It never should have been. Had the government, in 1991, not tried to spend its way out of a recession, had it had reasonable budgets in 1991, then we wouldn't have been in this spot. But here we are.

#### 2030

We're in a spot where the deficit would have been \$17 billion in the 1993 fiscal year. Even with the cuts of the expenditure control program and even with the tax increases, tax increases that I oppose, tax increases that the Progressive Conservatives oppose, still the deficit would have been too high, and the government looked at a second wave of cuts, the social contract.

The cuts to the municipalities are even deeper through the social contract program, and I think the people of Ontario should realize how much money is being taken from municipalities. An equivalent amount of money has been taken from hospitals and school boards as well.

In North York, it's almost \$6.5 million through the

social contract; in East York, \$1.5 million; in Oshawa, over \$2 million; \$1.5 million in Burlington; in Hamilton, almost \$5 million; in Kitchener, over \$3 million; in Ottawa, over \$10 million is being taken through the social contract program.

I've been really amazed with the attitude of the municipalities because I think they have been very, very cooperative. They have certainly put forward the problems they're going to face with such enormous cuts; cuts, I might add, that in many cases will represent up to 10% of their budget. In other words, they would have to increase local taxes by about 10% to cover the size of these cuts—enormous, when almost all of those same municipalities had targeted a zero per cent tax increase, no tax increase, because they recognize that people are fed up with tax increases. Still, the municipalities are struggling with this. They're not happy, naturally. They're going to have severe problems, but they're going to try to deal with it. I must say that it's a tremendously commendable attitude on behalf of the municipalities.

The obvious criticism of this whole process, and I've alluded to it, is that it was a very untimely process. It should have happened years ago, but at the very least it should have happened last year so that the municipalities, the school boards would know where they stood when they set their budgets.

The social contract process was just doomed to failure. There are too many people. Union leaders, leaders of various organizations, many of them, had no mandate to break the contracts, to strip the contracts. As a matter of fact, it's against their very essence. It's against their very essence of the union leaders to accept their contract being opened and rolled back and the compensation of their members reduced. Why would they ever accept a situation like that? It didn't make any sense.

Some didn't even have the authority to deal. The association of municipalities was at the table—I mentioned this in a question to the Finance minister—and did not have the authority to negotiate on behalf of the municipalities. They simply haven't been given that authority. They were there at the table because they felt they had to be, that they'd be criticized if they weren't, but they didn't have the authority to deal on behalf of the municipalities. So the whole thing was doomed to failure, and here we are, we've lost time.

The proposal's going to be legislated by August 1, I gather. They're still hoping that some sort of agreement will be made before August 1, but of course that won't happen, and the municipalities will be legislated on August 1. What sort of tools, what sort of weapons will they have to go to war with? These are the wonderful social contract mechanisms that are available to municipalities.

Number one, they'll be given a freeze. But a freeze



is too late. The municipalities have already done that. Municipalities almost unanimously, almost without exception across this province, have not provided for any wage increase, any compensation increase in their budgets for 1993. So they won't get any money out of that, precious little money out of that to offset the reduced grants from the provincial government. That's weapon number one.

Weapon number two is the pause day. This is a work of art, the pause day. It's anybody's guess how this is going to work. The idea is that those in the public sector will take a day off and will not be paid. They'll be taking a day off every month and will not be paid. That'll represent about 5% of the compensation level and that's how the money will be saved.

The only problem is that we're already a good chunk of the way through the year. Although the arbitrator didn't realize that the municipal year was different from the provincial year, I gather that's been set straight and as a result, the municipalities have been given the provincial year, until March 31, to make the cuts. But still, by August 1 we are four months into that year and there is nobody who believes that the pause days could be implemented before September 1, which means we'd be five months into the provincial year with only seven months left to realize the entire savings of the pause day. It's just impossible in seven months to have 12 pause days.

Not only that, but in certain areas, such as homes for the aged, there are legislated staff requirements, where there must be a certain number of staff on duty at all times, depending on the number of residents in the building. The same is true for day care. There must be a certain number of day care workers on staff at all times. There's a ratio that is legislated that must be obeyed. The only choice that the municipalities would have in terms of laying somebody off would be to violate this legislation. They can't do that, so they simply cannot realize a saving in those areas. In the area of health there are mandated programs from the province of Ontario to the municipalities that must be obeyed. I find it interesting, if the province expects days to be taken off and those mandated programs not to be realized.

There are essential services, the police, ambulance, fire. You can't take people off these essential areas. In some cases, for example in the area of fire prevention, there must be a certain number of firefighters on a vehicle: four on a pumper. You simply can't have three. You can't have one off on a pause day, because there must be four people or else the truck can't go out. Again, legislation.

So what's the answer? The government says to bank those days. If you can't take them right now, bank them for the future. Let the next government pay for it. That's a wonderful solution. We will take the day on a

holiday that we'd be off anyway and let it roll along. In the case of many of these workers, there would be 36 months involved—a three-year program is 36 months—so 36 days of banked days would have to be paid for in 1996 or somehow have to be accommodated in 1996. That would be a wonderful situation to inherit in 1996, this tremendous amount of compensation that would have to be recognized in some fashion. And not only that, but the pause day provision of course would expire for all the other workers in 1996 and they would expect to work a total year, not minus one day a month. So by the time 1996 rolled around, there would be millions and millions of dollars and there would be an explosion of costs to pay for the banked days and the pause days that would kick back in.

#### 2040

The third tool municipalities have is the layoffs. This is not one that's contemplated very energetically by the legislation, but given that pause days won't work, given that the freeze won't work, it only leaves layoffs left to be considered.

The problem with layoffs is that it's difficult to achieve the saving, because we have a valid approach here in Ontario that you must give notice to employees before laying people off and you must give severance to employees. An employee who has worked five years, for example, would get a four-week notice of termination and would get five weeks of severance, over two months of notice and severance together, and given that we're five months into the year with only seven months left, rather than saving seven months in terms of costs, only five months would be saved in costs. I think that's a very painful way to go for the saving entailed, but that's the kind of predicament that municipalities are left in.

It's been asked here, I guess all night long, what should be done? I can tell you what should have been done. If only we had the luxury of rolling back the clock. Then in the good times that the Liberals enjoyed, they shouldn't have spent like drunken sailors, they shouldn't have spent in the double digits. We should have had a little more fiscal responsibility in the province of Ontario, and then the government, in its first year in office, wouldn't have been put in the awkward situation it was from a budget point of view. Then the NDP shouldn't have tried to spend itself out of a recession. If those things had happened, we wouldn't be in the mess we're in today. And yes, of course, if you go back years ago, then I guess the Conservatives shouldn't have run up various deficits as well, although those deficits were minor by comparison to today.

But we can't turn back the clock, so the question is, what do we do here today? I think the member from Leeds-Grenville earlier this evening outlined the kind of approach we really need to take. We have to cut expenditures, and the expenditures have got to be cut in a

long-term sense so that the impact is not just a short-term gain to address an awful predicament in this year. The expenditure cuts should look at the long range; they should keep our expenditures down this year and through the years ahead. They should involve a hiring freeze over the three years of the social contract, they should involve a wage freeze on the anniversary date and, on overall program, should look very closely at the problems the Provincial Auditor has outlined, the problems pertaining to non-profit housing, the problems pertaining to welfare control and many of the other problems that we're facing, where we can get the expenditures down.

That's what we have to do. We have to, through a long-term plan, get our expenditures down and get the deficit down to zero so that the debt isn't increasing. That's the kind of program that certainly I want to support and that this Progressive Conservative Party wants to support.

There is another side that has to be done at the same time. It's fine to get the expenditures down, and certainly it will involve a hiring freeze and I have no doubt that through the general public sector there will be layoffs to accommodate the social contract reductions. But what happens to the people who are laid off? What is their outlook? Where do they get jobs? It's fine to get them off the government payroll, in a sense, and reduce our cost, but if they can't find jobs, then they need government support, and what have we gained? We haven't gained anything. As a matter of fact, we've gained a lot of anguish and heartache.

So what we need to do at the same time is improve the business environment, encourage business growth in the province of Ontario to get people back to work, not on a government cheque, not being paid by government but through the private sector. That has to be an integral part of our long-term program. We need to get that going as fast as possible.

We've heard suggestions today as to how we could accomplish that: Eliminate the tax increases because the tax increases are going to kill jobs. The tax increases in the budget that we have just seen this year will probably kill 50,000 jobs in the province of Ontario. Rather than kill those jobs, we need to keep those people at work.

We need to repeal the labour bill because that bill is certainly discouraging investment in the province of Ontario. We need to repeal that. We need to tell the business community, the investment community, that we are open for business in the province of Ontario. We want your money. We need expansion. We need business growth in the province of Ontario. We need to get people back to work. That's how it should be done, not on the government cheque.

I think I've run out of voice and verbiage at this point, but the social contract is, in many respects, a very unfortunate attempt, an untimely attempt by the provin-

cial government—it was a job that had to be done, but if it had only been accomplished when it was timely, then it would have been much more supportable. But I think perhaps with some amendments, amendments that we're going to put forward, we really need to get on with the job of cutting expenditures here in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Turnbull:** I would like to congratulate my colleague the member for Don Mills for an excellent debate. I would like to suggest that in the comments from the government side, hopefully there will be some answering of these questions that he's raised about pause days, because so far in this debate the government has ducked out of answering the problem that those people who are deemed to be essential services will have to take their pause days during holidays and that the pay for that time will be due and oweable in April 1996.

That's a cost that the next government is going to have to bear, and it's time we heard from this government on this issue. They have refused to answer this particular question. It is essential that we hear from the government some sort of response because that is its responsibility when it's listening to a debate about a substantive problem that we have with this bill, and we've heard so far absolutely no answer on this issue.

Perhaps we might hear something from the Liberals on the fact that during their days in office, in real terms, they were increasing spending by 5% per year, year over year, and the NDP has only been slightly worse at 5.5%, in real terms, in expenditure increases. That's fundamentally where the problem started, with the Liberals.

Let's hope that we can hear from both the NDP and the Liberals on these two essential elements as part of the debate that my colleague from Don Mills brought.

**Mr Mahoney:** I'm interested to hear the former mayor of East York in his comments on the impact on the municipalities because we have been calling on this side of the House for the Premier to explain what he means when he says he's going to take into account the impact on municipalities which have already made their cuts.

Last week, I enjoyed the day in Atikokan and heard from many people in the great northwest about the cuts that they had already made. You have a community of 3,500 people that has already made cuts. They're on four-day workweeks. They're already on four-day workweeks and they've laid off two of the people who work in their outside workforce. Now they're being told by this government they have to come up with, I think, if I recall correctly, the figure was another \$125,000.

That may not be a lot of money; this government seems to spill more than \$125,000 every day. But to a community like Atikokan, which has already pared to



the bone, which has already told its citizens that they have to close down all the municipal services one day a week, that they have to lay off the people who work in Atikokan one day a week to try to meet the cuts, we don't know if this government is going to react to that.

We hear about Hamilton which has made major cutbacks. All of the municipalities I've been talking to are saying, "We've cut to the bone; we have suffered the pain," yet the Premier's now saying he's going to take into account, although he won't admit what exactly he's going to take into account, perhaps the cuts that they've made, but no "broad-brush exemptions" I think is the term that was used.

They don't know what's going on. Whether it's Mississauga, whether it's Hamilton, whether it's East York or whether it's Atikokan, they're very, very frightened of what this government's going to do to them.

2050

**Mr Carr:** I'm pleased to comment on the member's speech tonight. I think it goes a long way to saying that here's a member who came in and won a by-election just a short period ago, here he is, he can come in and in a relatively short period of time, this individual has represented the people in his area and come to grasp issues that people on the other side have not.

For a year and a half, we've told you we are in the financial position that we are in and you continued day after day in here to say that you're going to spend your way out of it.

Quite frankly, I'm very proud to sit with a member who has come in here, who has a background of fiscal responsibility, who is going to take some of the things that he learned at the municipal level and bring them here to the Legislature. I might say that I'm very confident this individual will represent us very well when he forms part of the cabinet when this government is thrown out in 1995. It won't come too soon. Here's a man who has come in and has offered clear alternatives.

I understand, having watched Global news at 5:30 tonight, that the government is now going to follow some of the amendments we have proposed putting forward and that the public sector wage freeze will not commence until the anniversary date of the contracts. That's one of the things that we said we can do. I understand from Global television that's going to happen as one of the byproducts of allowing the unions to get back together.

I guess more than anything else, to see a fine member like the member for Don Mills come in and be able to talk so articulately about a situation, wherein he has been a new member, I think does us well, because in the future it's the individuals like the member for Don Mills who are going to form the government that gives

the people of this province hope that there are people out there who have the ideas, offering constructive solutions, who are not like the cynical old politics of the past where they just criticize. I take my hat off, as all members do, to the member for Don Mills.

**Mr Bradley:** I listened with a good deal of care, because I'm very interested in what members of all parties have to say on this legislation, and I wasn't able to determine whether the member for East York had indicated whether the Conservative Party was voting for or against the legislation.

I know that the leader of the party had, on many occasions, expressed a great desire to see such legislation increased. I've heard some of the members and their speeches and they've made some pretty compelling arguments that would point to voting against this legislation. Perhaps the member will help me out a bit when he gets a chance to respond whether he will be voting in favour of or against this legislation.

I think most people recognize there is a need for some kind of legislation to ensure that there is efficiency in government, to ensure that there is restraint, but I'm going to be very interested to hear what that constructive position will be on the part of my colleagues who sit to the left of me in the House. I know that the member, being a very straightforward individual, will help me out with that particular dilemma.

He also mentioned the municipalities. Those of us who have served on municipalities recognize that they are going to be hit rather significantly, having trimmed their own budgets, having their increases in provincial grants much lower than they had anticipated. They have gone through an exercise, as the member and other members have appropriately pointed out, of having trimmed any fat that might be there in the municipal budgets. They're now forced to cut some very essential services and are feeling the pinch once again as the government aims its financial guns at the municipalities.

I certainly hope the government will reconsider and assume its fair share of the cuts as opposed to simply thrusting them on local levels of government.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Don Mills, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr David Johnson:** In response to the member for St Catharines, what I intend to do, and I'm sure what my party intends to do, is to do what the people of Ontario want us to do, which is to cut expenditures in the provincial budget.

I can tell you, wherever I go, to the town hall meetings I go to, talking to people on the street, people recognize that the number one problem we've got to address at this point in time—

**Mr Mahoney:** Is this government.

**Mr David Johnson:** —it may be this government, but it's also to get expenditures down and not to

increase taxes. So what I intend to do is to work through this process and to reduce expenditures everywhere possible.

I thank the member for Oakville South. I'll be very delighted to join the member for Oakville South in the next cabinet, along with my other colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus. I thank the member for Mississauga West for his comments. I'm not sure what they were now exactly, but I'm sure they were excellent comments, very supportive.

I think the member for York Mills made the comments that are perhaps most germane in terms of we still don't understand how this pause day is going to work because it is going to result in the banking of days. There are a couple of other concerns too. For example, how does the province get the money from the Metro school board and the Ottawa school board when it doesn't pay those school boards any money today? Where is that money going to come from?

There are so many holes in this legislation that we really have to deal very seriously with it, but the one thing we don't want to do is simply to pass along the costs, the expenditures from today to three years down the road and have a tremendous burden on the taxpayers of Ontario three years from now. I think that's what the member for York Mills is pointing out and he's bang on.

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** I am pleased to speak about this most important and most difficult piece of legislation.

What is the social contract all about? It is a framework for negotiations between employers and workers in a time of massive structural change. Things cannot go on the way they have always been in Ontario. This framework will protect as much as possible the employees and the services in Ontario. These two underlying principles, our workers and their jobs and the services to every single person in Ontario, are what Bill 48 is based upon.

Everyone in Ontario knows we must achieve greater productivity, greater efficiency in the delivery of public services, and who know better than those front-line workers, whether they're in the hospitals day after day and giving that service or whether they're in the municipalities, whether they're out on the streets, cleaning the streets or whatever? These are the people who should be part of the negotiations. They know where the efficiencies should be and that's what we intend to do.

Let's talk a little bit further about the social contract. This framework introduces some very progressive measures to the unions of Ontario; for instance, some novel ideas on job security, also, the opening of the financial books to the employees. The social contract also ensures that the low-income public sector employees—that is, \$30,000 and less—are not affected.

Thirdly, it also contains firm deadlines. Negotiations cannot go on and on as we know we're dealing with a crisis now.

There are also strong incentives to negotiate in good faith. If negotiations take place before August 1, there are both reduced targets for the amount of savings in each sector and, secondly, access to a job security fund for workers.

Yes, this is extremely difficult to do and I believe the people of Ontario out there who are listening understand. In Niagara Falls, whatever street it is, whatever crescent it is, people live together. There are in the same street people who have worked for Cyanamid—the plant closed more than a year ago and one worker is now trying to start his own small business—and right next door is a worker at GM in St Catharines who is about to be laid off a year from now, and next door to him is a teacher, and next door to him is a social worker and next door to her is a small businessperson. They all know the hurt that is going on in Niagara Falls, that is going on across this province.

**2100**

Saturday morning I was in my office and I was returning some phone call messages. The first person I spoke to was a man who was representing the firefighters' union in the city of Niagara Falls. He was very concerned about his pension and I had to stop and explain that. The next person I happened to call was a woman whose husband had been laid off, and I believe it was from Cyanamid, and she said to me: "Yes, you must do this. You must do it fairly."

This morning I was in my office at about 9 o'clock and just as I was leaving, I got a note from a man who is a teacher at Stamford Collegiate and this is what it said, "According to information received, the NDP is reducing its lump sum payments to the unfunded liability of the teachers' payment plan; this is not fair ball," and he goes on. I would like to answer this teacher clearly and carefully.

There are significant savings in the government's overcontribution to two pension plans, one covering teachers and one covering our own government employees. Now, this is the crucial part: In both cases we have independent, actuarial advice that because of lower wage settlements and lower inflation, we are overcontributing to the plans, and that without in any way affecting the pension rights of our public sector employees, we will be able to reduce our contributions and still make sure the pension plans are well funded and sound.

The question is—this is the question that's been put to me and many of our colleagues here in the House—does the legislation strip the pension funds? The answer is no, the pension entitlements are not affected.



Teachers have every right to be concerned about the pensions after the fiasco of the Liberal years and what happened to their pensions then.

About a week ago, I had the opportunity to sit down and talk to Peter Salter, who is the president of District 7 of the OSSTF. We were talking about some of the suggestions that we might have for saving money. This man, who is the president of the local teachers' union, brought up a very interesting option and that was, he said to me: "What about the storm days during the winter when the school buses don't run, the schools are virtually closed and yet the teachers have to attempt to get there through the snow, maybe risk their own liability and health to get to school, to get paid. Why don't we just close the schools on that day and the teachers not get paid?" It makes sense. So the people who are out on the front lines do have options. They do know that there are places and room to negotiate.

One other thing that I have heard people complain about and be quite concerned about is that they say to me: "Margaret, what about job loss? You will hurt the economy." I say to them, "That is the last thing that this government wants to do, have job loss and hurt the economy."

Let's look at it. Across the province there has been an attrition rate; that is, people retiring or leaving, of about 1% to 2%. Out of 900,000 broader civil service folks, normally there would be about 18,000 who would be retiring or leaving, and the target of our government through the social contract has been a reduction of about 11,000 workers. Clearly, this is not about job loss at all. It is about efficient government, and that is what the people want. It's about efficient government right from the top down, and that's starting with the Premier, the cabinet and our MPPs. Whatever happens in the social contract, we will have to take too.

We have been in an era of more: Through the 1960s, through the 1970s, through the 1980s, we have had more taxes, more wages and more benefits for the unions and for the workers, but we are now in an era of less.

I'd like to quote from an article in the Toronto Star. It was May 22, from Mr Desmond Morton, who is from the University of Toronto: "Now let's examine this era of less. For union members, the alternative to the NDP is not job security, wage increases and free day care. No. It is NAFTA, it is the repeal of Bill 40"—which the previous speaker just indicated they would do—"and it is the bosses' agenda and the systematic union-busting. That is the alternative to this government's plan."

**Mr Sorbara:** Union-busting? This is the biggest union bust that's every been presented in this Legislature.

*Interjections.*

**Ms Harrington:** I would really like to go ahead and finish, Mr Speaker.

"Rae's model is Algoma Steel and northern paper mills, where his government has helped save companies in return for serious worker involvement in ownership. The idea that an NDP government would expect the 900,000 people whose wages come from the provincial coffers to accept lower wages in return for saving jobs and getting a voice in management is, well, socialist."

"So what happens next, I ask you. I ask the people of Ontario, will the union leaders continue fighting or will they grasp an opportunity? Will they pool their negotiating skills, accept economic realities and reap all the rewards a grateful NDP government can offer short of hard cash?"

These are the types of questions and difficult situations that we are in, and as the previous speaker on our side has said, this government will manage and we will manage this province well.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I'd like to respond briefly to the present speaker. I think without question that she has overlooked a very fundamental point, and that is that the legislation the NDP government has introduced, is one which strips away the rights of collective bargaining. It opens up contracts. It puts aside collective agreements which have been properly and reasonably negotiated.

I think it is clear that as a result of that, there will be a new order in terms of how governments are viewed, in terms of agreements that have been negotiated, and I think that is something that is going to weigh very heavily on the government. Many people are saying, how is it that someone can bring forward a piece of legislation which strips aside those particular rights?

Now there is another aspect to the discussion which I think somewhat goes overlooked, and that's the effect it may very well have on medical services and the provision of medical services. I know there are many growth areas in the region. In fact, I represent an area in Mississauga North in the region of Peel in which there is a growth region. I think the proposals that have been promoted through Bill 48 and through Bill 50 will have no other option but to seriously erode the medical services in many regions, especially growth regions. I hope to be dealing with that particular issue as the evening unfolds.

I think there are some real concerns as to how the government has utilized numbers in terms of doctors, how it has just haphazardly divided some numbers into population. I believe that many people will in the future feel the impact of chaotic, inconsistent and faulty reasoning that the government has promoted through Bill 48.

**2110**

**Mr Carr:** I'm pleased to enter the debate. I think the public would have more respect for the members opposite if they would also talk about some of the other

areas of spending cuts. For a little over a year, we've been giving them some alternatives, and it's interesting how one man changes his mind, the Premier changes his mind, and all of a sudden the speeches from all the backbenchers changed with him.

Where were you people when we were telling you for two years we couldn't continue on with this? While I respect that you have changed your minds and you have come to the realization that we are in trouble now, I think it is more driven by the fact that all of a sudden you realized that the people in the rest of the world are saying, "We're not going to renew our bonds in the province of Ontario."

The members opposite would have more credibility if they would take on some of the other areas. In our minority report, we talked about 15 points of things we should be doing, everything from social assistance reform, to Workers' Compensation Board reform, to non-profit housing, to the whole situation the way the finances are done, to the tax structure, to what should happen to the civil servants, to what should happen to municipalities, universities, school boards, hospitals, the entire public service.

We heard during that period, during the three weeks or so that we were on the finance committee, of the terrible economic condition we are in. Day after day we heard people on the government side saying that we had a difficult problem, but they weren't offering solutions. Then all of a sudden they come in with this particular bill, and quite frankly, the members of the public would have more respect if they would look at the other areas where we are spending and overspending.

When you look at the spending record of this government, it should be absolutely ashamed of the first year and a half. Their spending has now brought us to the situation we are in now, where we need these tough measures. I say to the members opposite, we appreciate the fact you recognize it now; we just wish and the people of this province just wish it had been done a lot sooner.

**Mr Hope:** I compliment the member for her comments. During the weekend I met a close friend of hers and a close friend of mine, Terry Savoie. I believe his wife, Phyllis, would totally disagree with what the Conservatives are saying in cutting social housing, because I know Phyllis was very active in the social housing movement, in making sure that housing was there for individuals when the private sector wasn't there. I know Phyllis, in her capacity and her boisterous voice that she has, would disagree.

I also notice you mention the issue about the free trade agreement, and it was amazing. Terry was right there again with his earring. He was talking in front of the graveyards about the effects that free trade has had in the area of job losses in the private sector. When I listen to the opposition talk about the devastation and

the revenue loss, they keep forgetting about a trade agreement that has been haunting a lot of people in the private sector, both the auto industry and the agricultural industry. It's amazing that all of a sudden, in only three years, we start to identify the problem, but agricultural communities—I know that you can share this with a number of other colleagues of yours—have been feeling this for a number of years.

When I listen to the members opposite who talk about the destroying of free collective bargaining, I question some of their motives with what was taking place back by the Liberals when they were in the federal House. I remember the great train ride that took place on 6 and 5, and most of us will remember the 6 and 5 that took place. I find it very ironic when the members from the Conservative Party speak. I guess you will agree that one of the things that they're bringing forward is the whole issue about privatization.

Again, with the Liberal Party, we've heard from the Liberal leader about 18 points and I'm still trying to figure out if that was 18 holes or if it was 18 points, because to this day we still haven't heard one of those 18 points that we've been waiting to hear.

**Mr Sorbara:** I was fascinated to hear in the remarks of the member for Niagara Falls a suggestion that somehow these measures have the general support of the people of the province. Do they not yet get the message? If they really believe in democracy, let's look at the reaction of the people not only in Ontario but across Canada to the policies of Bob Rae and the NDP government in Ontario.

It was only a couple of months ago that we had two by-elections in the province of Ontario. One of the seats was held by the government party; the other they had lost by just some 62 votes in the general election of 1990. I think the people spoke at that time. Both of the NDP candidates in that election got less than 10% of the vote. They lost their deposits. The people now and again express themselves and express an opinion through the democratic process about how the government is behaving and the extent to which the policies of government have general support. Look at what happened in the recent general election in Alberta: The NDP, the New Democratic Party, was completely wiped away from the political spectrum.

In the upcoming federal election, if Audrey McLaughlin wins two seats in Ontario, those seats will belong to Steven Langdon, who stands up for principle, and Howard McCurdy, who stands right next to him, down in the Windsor area. Do they not understand that the policies that they are bringing to Ontario are seen by the people of Ontario as destructive? And the people of Ontario are waiting for bated breath for an opportunity to rid themselves of this government.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. The member for Niagara Falls, you have two minutes to reply.



**Ms Harrington:** Yes, it certainly is a difficult time, and the people of Ontario, as the previous speaker has mentioned, are very worried and they're very concerned.

This is a turning point, and I think the unions across Ontario are dealing with that mental problem now of how to deal with a real turning point. What this government is actually offering them is an invitation to power share with the government and with private employers, something that is really new. It will take time to understand, and we are asking them to please come to the table and work with us. We know what the alternatives are—I have outlined them—and it is a repeal of Bill 40 and it is NAFTA. That's what the other parties stand for.

The member from Oakville spoke about the spending patterns of this government. I'd like to remind him, going way back to 1980, of the health care costs of this province were and how they escalated for the whole decade, from 1980 to 1990: 10%, 11%, year over year compounded. That is the kind of spending that this province is used to. It can no longer happen. This is indeed a turning point.

The people out there in Ontario realize this. They are worried. They want their sons and daughters to have jobs. They don't want the interest payments to overtake the amount we spend for education. That's what is happening at this very moment. The amount we spend for education is \$5 billion and more in this province, and the amount we spend on our interest payments is \$5 billion. Two years from now it will be substantially overtaken, both the amount we spend for education and health. People realize something has to be done.

**Mr Bradley:** I cannot say this evening that I am pleased to participate in this debate, because I'd hoped that it would not be necessary for the government to bring in the kind of legislation that it has, legislation which, in my view, upon reviewing it, is impractical, unworkable and ultimately simply isn't going to achieve what the government had hoped it was going to achieve by introducing such legislation.

I could go into a number of different areas tonight but, of course, we're all confined by Bob Rae's new rules to a mere 30 minutes to be able to deal with legislation that is as complex as this. Unfortunately, in a democracy, that is something that I don't think the government should be particularly proud of as it enters its third year of public office.

I've listened with considerable interest to the strategy of the Progressive Conservative Party, which is next to us. For the first couple of years they spent some time attacking the government. They have now made the assumption that the government is dead in the water—an assumption that I would not agree with, by the way; I never agree until election time that there are any conclusions one can draw—but they have concluded that and have now trained their guns on the party which

is well ahead in the polls at this point in time, the Liberal Party, instead of dealing with the legislation that's before the House.

They have a very selective memory, because I've sat in this House since 1977. I well recall what the expenditures were on such things as Suncor, the government advertising—which this government appears to be falling into the trap of now—and of course, at one time, the Premier of the province of Ontario wanted to buy a new jet for the convenience and comfort of the cabinet and senior members of the government. I recall rising in the House day after day to ask the Premier about the jet: what was new in it, what the new costs might be. Eventually, they withdrew that proposal for the jet, I'm sure to the chagrin of the present Premier and anybody who has had that particular portfolio since the time of Premier Davis.

**2120**

Everyone in this House—at least most people in this House; I can't say everyone—probably agrees that this is a time to concentrate on government efficiency and frugality. You won't find many people in Ontario who will quarrel with that, except those who are directly affected by that efficiency and frugality.

I join, as I did when I was the critic of the present Minister of Finance, then called the Treasurer, in the first year of the recession when we recommended to the government—and I recommended to him at that time, because I had sat around the cabinet table and I know what the demands are, that they examine each expenditure, line by line, in each department and postpone some programs that may be attractive, eliminate other programs that in the 1990s were no longer necessary and perhaps not proceed at all with some new programs that may have been attractive and nice but not necessary.

Instead, the government made a specific decision. It made a decision to try to spend its way out of the recession. I wish the government had been successful for the sake of my fellow citizens in the Niagara region and in other parts of the province, but it was not a successful strategy. It was probably doomed to failure from the beginning because if we look at ourselves as individuals, if when we find that we're in economic difficulty we begin spending a lot of money, we find out that down the line we're in worse debt, we're in worse problems than had we addressed it at the beginning of the downturn. The government did not do that. That's history, and the government finds itself in some difficult positions today.

I have made the argument with those who are interested in social programs and those in the field of the environment, where I was involved for a number of years, that although the NDP's heart would be in the right place for expanding those programs, increasing those programs, for addressing a variety of needs in our society, its inability to manage the economy, its policies

which are not geared to attracting investment but rather redistributing income would have the effect of ensuring that there would be less money available to spend on those programs and fewer resources. I think that probably those circumstances have been borne out by fact as we are in the midst of 1993.

I've heard members, because it's a good headline with people to use it, go overboard talking about slashing and cutting and restraint. I think as all of us embark upon this—and it's as important for members of the opposition as it is for the government—we must recognize that when we start cutting, people start getting hurt, that when we invoke severe austerity measures on a province or any jurisdiction it means there's a reduction in services. So when I'm talking to people in my constituency and other parts of the province who talk about the fact that programs are being cut and that they don't want that particular program cut but please cut some other program—that there are consequences to being in these circumstances, and they're viewing those consequences on a daily basis.

I met last Friday morning with a group of people—and people I am very sympathetic with. I've said in this House on many occasions that it seems to me that most of us at least, and I certainly consider myself in this category, are elected to represent those who are unable to adequately represent themselves, that the rich and the influential really don't need the services of MPPs, but those who are disadvantaged in many ways, those who are the most vulnerable in society, require our services.

I met with a group of people—there were two categories of them: One, they were called care givers and these are people who have at home Alzheimer's patients or others who are suffering from similar kinds of dementia; and the second were respite workers who are employed, on contract in our case, by the regional municipality of Niagara.

These are people who are on—and they use this terminology—a 48-hour-a-day basis. Of course, they said that for emphasis. We all know there are only 24 hours in a day, but to them it seems almost like a 48-hour day, where they care on an ongoing basis for Alzheimer's patients and other patients who suffer from dementia.

The respite workers serve a purpose. They come into the homes for a few hours, perhaps up to 20 hours a week, and give some relief to those so that they can maintain their own sanity so we can avoid circumstances where there might be elder abuse just out of frustration and so that they provide some variety and spice of life to some of these patients who still have some grasp of what's going on about them.

This program has to be cut. Now, when I say cut, I want to be fair here. It doesn't mean the government is coming in and slashing the program, but as the number

of people increase who are in need of this particular service, it means that fewer hours are going to be available if the government isn't prepared to increase the amount of money.

So that's what we mean when we talk about restraint, and if we're going to be spending money, and I'm going to be recommending that we spend money in this area, then we have to find other suitable areas to cut.

I must mention at this point in time—and I'm not trying to be cheap politically to say it; I've discussed this with the Chair of Management Board through questions in the House—two different things that the government continues to do, and that is, it's involved in polling—and from one point of view, ethically the NDP was always opposed to it, particularly the man who is presently the Premier of this province and who was the most sanctimonious opposition leader I've ever confronted. But I actually believed, I was under the impression, that he was going to be different; that ethically and morally the NDP was opposed to polling. They knew where they stood anyway. They didn't need to wait for the latest puff of wind to come along to see which way the flag was blowing. One thing I liked about NDPers then is they knew where they stood.

I want to mention—I'm going to have an opportunity to speak about him tomorrow—that one such New Democrat passed away this past weekend: Bud Germa in Sudbury. Bud Germa was a person who knew where he stood. I express my condolences to the family. I met Bud at Floyd Laughren's 20th anniversary celebration of his service to the people of Nickel Belt and to the people of Ontario. I always admired Bud Germa; I didn't always agree, but I always admired him because you knew where he stood. He would be the kind of person who I think would be uneasy about what is happening at this time.

I know that the kind of polling that goes on has gone on before. I know that the kind of advertising that's going on has gone on before. But it seems to me that when the government is trying to set the example, is trying to encourage others to accept very difficult cuts in essential services and is prepared to abrogate contracts and to demand concessions from those in the public sector unions, the least the government can do is eliminate those expenditures which are unnecessary.

The full-page ad I saw by the Premier was a blatant—excuse the word—Mulroneyesque tactic. That's what the federal government does all the time. You get the pamphlets in the mail, paid for by the taxpayers of the country. You get the full-page ads. Last summer we had Canada 125 where they sang that nice song that we were all singing by the end of the summer. And here it is: The NDP doing exactly the same thing. I find this disconcerting when you're trying to persuade others to accept the kind of severe austerity that you are recommending.



If I were to talk to people in my constituency and ask them what is their number one problem, they would undoubtedly say "employment" and they'd say it more bluntly: "I need a job." They're worried that their own jobs no longer exist.

You know, industrial workers over the years have lost their jobs and they've been on temporary layoff, and they bounce back. It's never easy, but they have a resiliency that some others do not have.

The number of people who are out now who have the so-called white collar jobs, who've never been unemployed, who've never had to adapt, who've never had to adjust, are finding it extremely difficult at this time when faced with unemployment. You can see it in their faces as they come into our constituency offices that they're genuinely worried, that they don't know where they're going to go next.

The industrial workers are in the same position. They've lost their jobs, but many of those people have experienced those job losses before and they've fought back and they've come back into the workforce, sometimes with the assistance of government; sometimes without.

It pains me to see the kind of unemployment that we have in this province that the Premier is prepared to entertain. I'm not saying he wants it; he doesn't. Nobody on any side of the House wants it, but the figures are just rattled off in the budget as though somehow this is to be a fact of life.

2130

It seems to me that we have to produce jobs for older workers who are losing theirs, that we have to have a climate in the province where we have jobs for women and men and others who have not been able to get into the workforce, that young people have to have some hope. There's a lot of hopelessness among young people out there who can't find, not only summer jobs, but can't find any jobs. They've perhaps expended a lot of money on an education for that purpose or they've worked hard for it or perhaps they simply need the money and do not have those jobs. But I think we cannot forget that this is the number one problem confronting this province.

When we talk about restraint, I think it has to be targeted. I think we all want the efficiency, but we can't simply throw everything away and allow these people who are unemployed to fend for themselves, because they can't fend for themselves, nor should they have to, and I think that the overwhelming majority of those people actually want to work and do not want to be on any kind of public assistance.

I don't think it was helpful for the government to bring in tax increases in the midst of a recession. Other governments have brought in tax increases. The Conservatives—for years I recall talking about the many tax

increases they brought in. The Liberal government brought in tax increases.

In the context of a booming economy, the economy is often able to sustain those. Nobody likes them and the member for Middlesex should listen to this instead of simply yapping over there. Nobody likes tax increases, but in the midst of a recession, the very time you want to pull out of the recession, the very time when people who are investing want to make a choice as to where they're going to invest as the economy improves, you don't smack \$2-billion worth of new taxes on them. The economy can't sustain it. There are times when the economy can sustain a lot of things and there are times when it can't. I think it was a calculated error. The Treasurer wants the revenue.

The Premier saw the W5 program on New Zealand. I see the Fraser Institute—by the way, the Fraser Institute is going to be praising this government soon because of the policies that it's bringing forward. But they got spooked by the New York lenders and so on, and all of a sudden the Premier says, "There's going to be a \$17-billion deficit and we're going to have to throw everything at this and forget about some of the other important programs out there."

So I feel bad for those people. I find it unbelievable that an NDP government, of all governments, would be bringing in legislation of this kind. I sat in this House through the debates on the wage and price controls, and I well remember Bob Mackenzie and the group to the left—because I had to scour the Hansards and I had to find all this information: what they had done in BC when they were in power; what the NDP had done in Manitoba when they were in power; what they had done in Saskatchewan when they were in power and faced with difficult, financial circumstances.

I was able to find what NDP—it doesn't surprise me so much what this government has done—governments had done. Hansards quoted Dave Barrett castigating the unions for being unreasonable, Ed Schreyer for bringing in wage and price controls in that province or agreeing to the federal ones, and in Saskatchewan, legislating nurses back to work before they even went on strike. This was a necessity the government saw, but I remember those debates where Mr Mackenzie, who is now the Minister of Labour, and others were so vociferously opposed to wage and price controls and now impose something far more drastic than that.

I'm surprised to see that there is an NDP government which is demanding concessions. When I talk to people in the trade union movement in my community, the one word they don't like is "concessions." They don't like it. It doesn't mean that they don't entertain them from time to time if there's something to be gained when there's a concession given; but here is a government where many of the people have fought against the demand for concessions for years and are now being

forced to vote in favour of a bill that in fact demands concessions, that demands the abrogation of contracts, that demands backward steps on the part of public sector workers.

We all know that public sector workers, and I think many members on the government side would agree with this, are an easy target today because people who have been unemployed out there, people who have been in business and so on look at public sector workers and say: "There's been some security over the years. There's been some remuneration which has caught up with the private sector and, in some cases, surpassed it."

So to bash the public sector is always easy. My belief is that many people in the public sector are prepared to play their part, are prepared to work with the Legislature to see what changes can be made so efficiencies can be effected without the kind of drastic legislation that we see before us.

So I wait. I listen to people who have been critical of Liberal and Conservative governments in the past.

I watched with great interest the show at Gananoque this weekend. A lot of people thought that in fact there would be a big fight at Gananoque and they leaked out to their favourite government writers these stories that it was going to be a tough clash and Bob was going to have a tough time.

You have to recognize who goes to the provincial council. The people who go to the provincial council, many of them are the ring kissers from all parties—

**Mr Hope:** Oh, you wait until I start telling some of the boys from St Catharines.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Order, please.

**Mr Bradley:** —who go there to kiss the Premier's ring.

**Mr Hope:** I'm going to send them a copy of Hansard.

**Mr Bradley:** And what they do is, they say, "Well, Premier, whatever you say, it's right, because you're the person who leads our party," and I invite the member for Chatham-Kent to send whatever he wishes, because so many people who in principle—in principle—oppose this kind of legislation and the kind of measures that this government has brought in for two and a half years are often silent today when the present government does it, but they wouldn't have been silent with a Liberal or Conservative government in power. So if they're prepared to kiss the ring of the Premier as he is making his speech and, "Bob, you're doing a great job," well, at least I admire those people out there who have been strong enough to challenge the Premier and members of the cabinet, and I'm sure all of my friends from St Catharines who were at the meeting would be people who would be challenging the Premier, because they are people of principle who over the years have fought for

collective bargaining rights and who have fought against Tory restraint.

I belong to a coalition—we want to save jobs in the Niagara Peninsula—and they asked a question at one of the meetings. They were going to Ottawa to protest the federal government policies, and some of them asked at the meeting, "Is it all right for us to take signs representing our coalition for the future of the Niagara Peninsula?" I said to them at the time, "I find it quite all right for you to carry those signs or wear the badges when you're going to Ottawa to protest Tory policies, because I carry those signs and wear those badges when I'm protesting Tory policies at Queen's Park, the Tory policies of Bob Rae." So they were quite prepared to go off to Ottawa and make their protest, and I'm quite prepared to come to Queen's Park to talk about some of the Tory policies that I have seen implemented by this government.

I want to talk about the effect on boards of education and municipalities. Those people have been forced, over the last couple of years, to trim their expenditures rather drastically. That's because this government has not transferred to them the kind of money that they would hope for and expected. They used to complain when a Liberal government wouldn't give them 8%, in some cases. There would be a great complaint. Now they're asked to take a freeze and perhaps even a cut. So what we see is that the municipalities are being very hard hit.

Has the government said, "Well, in consideration of this, you're no longer obligated to deal with the following programs"? They have not said that. If they had said that, the municipalities and the boards of education would say: "We understand. We no longer have to meet those requirements set out by the province and therefore we're better able to trim our expenditures." But no such thing exists.

So the local municipalities have to cut essential services, and in education, special education is being cut back and other programs which might be useful to the children who will be the future leaders in our province and our country, and those students who are in community colleges and in universities. My colleague the member for Ottawa South, Dalton McGuinty, asked a question in the House not long ago about the future places available for young people in our colleges and universities, for the girls and the boys coming through the system now, the young men and the young women who are going into that system, and we find that there are going to be fewer spaces available, and for those who are going out to fill those spaces, it's going to cost them more. Even though the NDP was always in favour of abolishing tuition, we find that in fact tuition has gone up, and the grant which was available to alleviate problems for some is gone and we find that those students are in difficulties. So not only are the spaces not there, but the cost is higher for those students, and



that's most unfortunate in NDP Ontario.

2140

I talked to a couple of students when I saw them in St Catharines not long ago. This puts a name to the real problems: a girl by the name of Megan Gilgan and a boy by the name of Brad Ryder, who both attended the University of Ottawa. These are people who have to put out a certain amount of money to get their education, who were fortunate enough, in their case, to be able to be accepted a couple of years ago to participate in a university education. Well, those people today, if they went knocking on the doors of a university, might find it much more difficult to obtain the program they had hoped to participate in, and they would find that the cost is increasing. As the tuition goes up, as the amount of money going to the universities is diminished, perhaps even the quality of education might be diminished significantly as a result. So we find that people in that category are very difficult. To people like Megan and Brad, we wish them the very best in the future, but we know that there could be problems for them.

I want to go back for just a moment to the polls and the advertising, because I could have taken the same questions I asked of Bill Davis and the government and used exactly the same questions, except that I had the quotes of the Premier. One thing I think the government wishes would happen is that we would destroy Hansard after two years, the record of everything that's said in the House, because Bob Rae had some good speeches on polling and on government advertising. I wish he were here. He was unavoidably not here today, but I wish he had had the opportunity to be here so that he could hear his words read back into the record about matters of polls and advertising.

I want to touch on something I did in one of the two-minute responses a while ago, when I listened to some of the speeches in the House, particularly from members of the Conservative Party. I cannot recall receiving a question, in five years, three months and four days as Minister of the Environment of Ontario, that asked that the government reduce its expenditures in the field of the environment, reduce its staff, reduce its activity or reduce the amount of equipment available. In other words, virtually every question, either directly or indirectly, suggested that the government should be spending more and putting more resources into it, and I suspect that would be the case of all ministers. So my good friends in the Conservative Party who sat in the House at that time, including my good friend the member for Mississauga South, who was very concerned and continues to be concerned about the environment, asked questions which were largely asking that the government play a greater role in the environment, with the implication of greater expenditure of funds, more staff and more resources available to them. Every minister was in that position.

So when we look back and we hear people talk about, "Well, money was spent in the old Tory days or money was spent in the old Liberal days," it was often at the demand of members of the New Democratic Party, whom I commend for their effectiveness in being able to communicate to the public at large, certainly to the news media, certainly to the CBC and certainly to Radio Noon where the public could hear an NDP voice in the morning or in the midday or late in the afternoon, an NDP voice on the radio demanding more money be spent on something. They were good advocates, those people, the same people who now say that the Liberals were wild spenders or the Tories were wild spenders. Again, my good friends in the Conservative Party had asked for expanded programs, new projects in those days when there was money.

Everybody recognizes today that the revenues are not coming in, that the economy is not strong, and it seems to me what we have to do is restore that economy, restore to the province of Ontario a circumstance where people want to invest, a climate where people who have dollars to invest are prepared to invest those. You can't do it by using regulations and legislation which is interpreted as being anti-business. You can't use it with anti-business rhetoric.

Sometimes it isn't pleasant to do it, and there are occasions when the Premier has to go on bended knee to business or on bended knee to New York City to make those pleas so that the people there will give him a reasonable credit rating. I don't criticize the Premier when he does that. In fact, I wanted him to go to Detroit so that he could speak to the leading people in General Motors and try to persuade them to keep their operations open in St Catharines. Instead he headed off on a trip to Asia and other places, all well and good in its time and its place, but I would have thought it would have been timely for the Premier to go to Detroit at that time to make the plea on behalf of workers in our part of the province.

What we have to do, it seems to me, is have a situation where we have public sector people brought together on a sector-by-sector basis to discuss their problems and find some solutions. I don't say that it's easy. I suspect that most people in the province of Ontario, including those of us on this side of the House, hope that this problem can be solved. If the government gets the credit for it, so be it. I think we hope it can be solved.

I don't think this specific piece of legislation is going to solve the problem. I think it's a very drastic piece of legislation which is an attack on public sector workers and public sector contracts, on one hand; on the other hand, for those who might be attracted to it for that reason, they should recognize that it provides no solutions at the expiry dates of these contracts, that in fact that's where problems could arise, where everything

would break loose at the end of the time lines for this legislation and we would find mass strikes in the province and we would find a good many dissatisfied people.

I'll be interested to see two things. I'll be interested to see how my colleagues in the Conservative Party vote on this, because I think there are many in the Conservative Party who would like to vote against this legislation, and with justification. I'll be even more interested to see how many people on the government side who have spent a lifetime fighting against this kind of legislation and these kinds of policies, how many of those people are in the House to vote against this legislation.

I commend my friend, formerly of St Catharines, the member for Perth for, on a matter of principle, resigning her position in the cabinet. Whether people agree or disagree with that position, she felt strongly about it. She has been a supporter of trade unions and the sanctity of contracts and she chose to resign. I simply ask that members of the government who disagree with this legislation join with us in voting against it.

**Mr Stockwell:** I think the comments from the member for St Catharines certainly spoke a great deal about previous legislators, previous governments and their capacity to spend. I think probably from even 1980 on Conservatives, Liberals and New Democrats tended to spend significant amounts of money that the public in fact didn't have. I think it got progressively worse.

That's probably partisan, you're going to suggest, but I think it did get progressively worse from the Conservative administration to the Liberal administration, and now the socialist administration I think is particularly bad. Probably, mindful of the deficit numbers they've rung up in two years, three years, I don't think they've got a rival in the camp of spending.

I will note, though, that the member for St Catharines did point out that when in opposition the socialists themselves, every time an announcement was made, would say, "Spend, spend, spend." The Liberals would in fact spend and then their rally cry would be, "Not enough, not enough, not enough." Now, upon being in government, they've certainly changed that tune.

But there is one thing that I do recall, and I'd like the member for St Catharines to comment on it. When they were in opposition they did have two areas of concern that they thought too much government money was being spent on, and those were polls and advertising. I note that previous administrations were dressed down on a regular basis by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Robert K. Rae QC, for spending far too much money on polls and far, far too much money on advertising.

Maybe he did comment on it, but I think it's something that needs to be emphasized once again, considering the fact of the hundreds and thousands of dollars

you spent placing partisan, cheap political ads in all the major dailies across this province, considering where you came from and how terrible that kind of situation was in previous administrations.

2150

**Mr Sorbara:** I had an opportunity to listen as attentively as I could to the remarks of the member for St Catharines. My colleague Mr Bradley for St Catharines is one of the people in this chamber who really can bring a sense of history and a sense of perspective to a debate. He's able to go back to the Bill Davis years and most particularly he is able to call Bob Rae's activities now into question, given the Bob Rae some of us knew when Bob Rae was in opposition.

The amazing thing about this debate, I think, is that this now is the pinnacle of the converted Bob Rae. This is the Bob Rae who has not only turned his back on promises made during election campaigns, not only turned his back on policies that he vigorously held during his years in opposition, but the Bob Rae who has turned his back on his strongest and most committed supporters, those people in the trade union movement.

But the thing that my friend from St Catharines pointed out, I think, in the gist of his speech was that in the end the people of Ontario are not going to tolerate this. They are looking for politicians who are committed to a set of principles and committed to implementing those principles if called upon to do so. What we have seen over the past three years in Ontario, from government advertising, to vicious little pieces of business like this Bill 48, to a turnabout on virtually every policy that the NDP stood for, is a denial of principle and a violation of the trust that is at the very foundation of politics. My friend from St Catharines points out that again and I think he does so very effectively and in that respect adds very greatly to this debate.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I just would like to comment on some of what the former Minister of the Environment, the member for St Catharines, has said.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Heavy on the "former."

**Mrs Marland:** The current minister says I should be heavy on the former minister.

First of all, I think it's important to address the fact that we have more cabinet ministers in the House at this moment than we did—

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Than we had for question period.

**Mrs Marland:** Than we do in question period.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** This is a time of substance, though.

**Mrs Marland:** The member for Mississauga North pointed out that's probably the reason that you're all here tonight, because you don't have to answer any



questions. If you do wish to stand up, if you feel compelled to stand up and answer any questions, especially my minister who didn't answer my questions earlier today, please feel quite welcome to stand up and use this valuable time.

But the member for St Catharines did talk about when he was Minister of the Environment and I was his critic. Now, he and I had an excellent relationship. Everything I asked him, he did answer. I do give him full marks; when I asked him questions when he was Minister of the Environment, he did answer those questions. He wasn't like the current government. We used to get answers; not always the answers that we agreed with, but at least we got answers. As the Minister of the Environment, he did more in this province, I must say, than the successor in your government unfortunately, and that was a big surprise and a big disappointment to us.

**Mr Elston:** I want to join with the people who have indicated pleasure with the content of the member's speech. In fact he went over some ground, I think, which needed to be reviewed, information about how the members of the New Democratic Party of Ontario have changed their attitude.

What he didn't say and what I would add to some of the words was that they have not only changed the tone of their attacks on problems, they have changed their orientation and the way they deal with matters. They no longer advocate for anybody who has a need in this province, but they adopt words which are well chosen to defend themselves from attack, because of their new posture with respect to social problems and obligations.

That they try to indicate that their new-found zeal for the job of government, their new-found zeal for being Tories in tweed, as they have been described several times, is for me not much of a job. They have in previous days been, if not the best advocates, if not the best—

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No one is wearing tweed.

**Mr Elston:** The member for Algoma says there are no NDPs wearing tweed any more. That was before they found all the money that they get paid as ministers. They only wore tweed before then.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Corduroy.

**Mr Elston:** Corduroy and tweed. They were wearing tweed too.

But what these people have done is they have turned their backs on the traditions of their party, including a good number of the principles for which they stood: things like not allowing gambling, things like not pushing people to try desperate means to protect their heritage and other things. Common pause days were part of their orientation.

I think we should commend the member for St Catharines for his remarks.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for St Catharines has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Bradley:** I appreciate the interventions of various people. I'll try to respond to them, as I fairly should.

First of all, Mr Sorbara, the member for York Centre, I thought reinforced many of the comments that have been made. I appreciate that.

Mr Stockwell, because he was out taking important telephone calls from his constituents regarding the social contract, missed the fact that I had mentioned a number of times within my remarks that they were spending over \$1 million on polls and spending all kinds of money on government advertising. I know he'll feel relieved that I did manage to mention that in my remarks.

Mrs Marland, the member for Mississauga South, was very kind in her remarks. I share her surprise, because I think both of us would have anticipated that there would have been a very activist government in the field of the environment. We have not seen the kind of activism that many people who are NDP supporters would have hoped for. The economic circumstances may be what dictates this, but certainly I agree with her that there was a great expectation there.

Mr Elston, the member for Bruce, recalls the history. I think it's very important to have that historical perspective on the House. I always like to look at people when they were in opposition, what they had to say. I recognize there's one role in opposition and another in government, but I must say that I used to read carefully the speeches of the man who is now the Premier of this province.

I used to make sure I was in the House when they spoke: Mr Rae, Mr Lewis, Mr Renwick, Mr Lawlor, many of the speakers in this House. I would hope that upon reaching government they would not forget those principles. Unfortunately, I understand some of the changes that have to be made and I accept those. What I don't accept are those changes which have been made in terms of their ethical approach to government.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? The honourable member for Mississauga South.

*Applause.*

**Mrs Marland:** Was there some applause on the government side of the House?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** After the performance.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** Yes, we are not like them, sucking up.

**Mrs Marland:** Oh, that's right.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Even after what you said about the Minister of Environment.

2200

**Mrs Marland:** Actually, I would point out to the

current Minister of Environment that I only spoke about the successor to the member for St Catharines; I did not speak about the current Minister of Environment.

I wish I could say that it gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity to stand in my place and speak on Bill 48, the Social Contract Act, but in fact, I really believe these evening sessions of the House are an absolute waste of time. If you listen to the dialogue that goes back and forth across the floor of this House, added to the fact that when we should be productive during the day, during question period, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, we very often do not have—I think today we had seven cabinet ministers missing, which is seven out of, what do you have, 25 in your cabinet? In any case, one day last week, I was shocked to see how few cabinet ministers were here for question period.

Frankly, I think the whole exercise is a waste of time because of the fact that the government has such a stranglehold on this House since it amended the rules for the proceedings in this House a year ago. So we get up now and we have at most 30 minutes to speak.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** You ain't seen nothing after this bill.

**Mrs Marland:** You say we haven't seen anything until after this bill. You see, that's how it works. It's all a big threat, and I object to being threatened. That has been our experience in opposition with this government.

The shortsightedness of this government, however, is amazing, because you can be assured that when we win the next election and these government members are on our side of the House, sitting in opposition, they will then know, the few of them who will be left, what it's like for a government to have a stranglehold on the House whereby debate is limited. We have motions to introduce closure and to limit debate even further than it's already limited. We had in fact two speakers on the budget.

In talking about Bill 48, I want to say at the outset, first of all, that I have a motion here that was faxed to me today by the regional chairman of Peel, Chairman Emil Kolb. This is a resolution which was passed by the GTA mayors. It was the GTA mayors' social contract resolution and it was adopted in principle on June 18, 1993, which was last Friday, three days ago. I want to read this resolution into the record:

"Whereas confusion, frustration and chaos exist over the social contract legislation; and

"Whereas many municipalities are not able to give some essential service workers 12 days off and still function safely and effectively; and

"Whereas the present social contract is pitting one sector against another within the same municipality (eg, emergency services versus office workers); and

"Whereas a number of municipalities have already implemented days off without pay in 1993 in order to

keep property tax increases either low or at zero; and

"Whereas the social contract seriously undermines the flexibility necessary for democratically elected municipal leaders to fulfil the mandate given to them by their electorate;

"That notwithstanding the present status of the legislation, the mayors of the GTA petition the Premier to immediately amend the social contract legislation to allow the simple, workable option of a basic across-the-board wage reduction for all municipal politicians, employees and workers directly employed by the municipalities as an acceptable way to meet the \$165-million reduction plan if a municipality's individual situation makes the across-the-board rollback or blend of options the most practical, effective and responsible means to achieve the provincial targets imposed upon municipalities."

I believe that is a very reasonable resolution passed by the greater Toronto area mayors. I'm very happy to place that resolution on the record and, needless to say, it is a resolution that is supported by my own mayor, Hazel McCallion. Obviously, we are hoping that the Premier and his cabinet will give due consideration to that motion.

Further on the subject of the Social Contract Act, while governments today and parties of all political stripes have taken up the cause of debt reduction and spending controls, the Ontario PC Party has been calling for years for smaller, affordable government and has put on the record a range of measures to achieve those objectives.

In a 1988 pre-budget report, long before it became politically correct to express concerns about such matters, Mike Harris proposed that debt reduction and expenditure control become the primary focus of provincial fiscal policy, that the government develop a mid-term fiscal plan to balance the budget, that sunset provisions be attached to all direct and tax expenditure programs and that any in-year revenue windfalls would be dedicated to deficit reduction.

During the NDP government's first year in office when it was signing contracts with its OPSEU buddies that provided for pay hikes of nearly 6%, the Ontario PC Party was calling for a 2% cap on pay hikes in the public sector. In the first volume of its New Directions series of policy papers, the Ontario PC caucus called for, among other things, reductions in the size of the Ontario public service and the privatization of government functions and crown agencies.

In its 1993 pre-budget opinion, the PC caucus called for a moratorium on the non-profit housing program, better control of welfare spending, a crackdown on health card fraud and a multi-year freeze on program spending as the key to a long-term strategy of deficit reduction. The record clearly shows that the Ontario PC



Party was pushing the fiscal responsibility bandwagon long before anyone else jumped on board.

While Bill 48 was introduced by an NDP government, the names of David Peterson, Bob Nixon and Lyn McLeod should appear on the front cover along with Floyd Laughren, because the Liberals and their tax-and-spend fiscal policies bear much of the responsibility for the financial and fiscal problems confronting the province. Bill 48 is very much part of the Liberal legacy. Despite the fact that the Liberals governed during an economic boom, they increased expenditures at double the annual rate of inflation and paid for this spending binge with 33 tax hikes and a 30%, or a \$10-billion, increase in the provincial debt.

Under the Liberals, the size of the Ontario public service grew from 80,000 in March 1985 to 88,000 in March 1990, and the public service payroll costs, wages and benefits, jumped by 60% from \$2.7 billion to \$4.4 billion during the Liberals' time in office. The Liberals elevated and broadened the expenditure base to an unsustainable level, and as they had at the same time substantially exhausted the province's tax capacity, when the boom ended and the revenues dried up, the house of cards collapsed.

The NDP compounded the problem they inherited from the Liberals by making the fatal error in their first budget of trying to spend their way out of the recession. This misguided strategy, which drove up program spending by 12% in the first year, did nothing to shorten or weaken the recession but did institutionalize the multibillion-dollar deficits which have become the norm in Ontario.

**2210**

The Liberal Party's record of mismanagement in government makes its declared opposition to Bill 48 easy to understand but difficult to accept. Although they helped to cause the mess, the Liberals don't have the decency to help clean it up. It is even more difficult to accept in light of that party's failure to advance a comprehensive, comprehensible and consistent policy alternative to the government's program.

The Liberal position is dictated more than anything else by the old political reflex which puts the interests of organized groups and lobbies with money and access to the process ahead of the interests of the taxpayers and the public generally. This allegiance to the vested interests may generate campaign contributions and reduce the heat on Liberal members, but it will never generate the types of reforms required to streamline the public sector and protect the taxpayer.

The Liberals' opposition to Bill 48, their failure to commit to a policy of restraint, shows that they still opt for the expedient position as opposed to a responsible one. By refusing to be part of the solution, they remain part of the problem.

Because Floyd fiddled while Ontario's financial house was burning down around his ears, Bill 48 is a panic-driven, ad hoc response to a fiscal crisis the government did its best to ignore. It was not until it became obvious that debt service costs would soon dominate expenditures and that the province was headed for a major and damaging downgrade that the government acted. But even then it did not want to bite the bullet. Instead of bringing in legislation to signal the seriousness of both the situation and its intention to achieve savings, the NDP opted for the so-called "social contract" process.

The NDP government counted on its so-called "special relationship" with labour to help bail it out of the fiscal quicksand. The unions, however, had other ideas, and when "Solidarity Forever" with the NDP went out one door, Bill 48 came in the other.

The PC Party has, unlike the Liberals, offered the government a plan which would achieve permanent reductions in the size and cost of the public sector and facilitate restructuring, without the chaos and inequity associated with Bill 48.

The PC Party's commitment to the goals of expenditure control and deficit reduction do not blind it to the fact that Bill 48 is a seriously flawed piece of legislation. To improve the process, correct some of the flaws in Bill 48 and attain a broader range of objectives, the PC Party has suggested a number of principles and policies which it believes will achieve permanent reductions in the size and cost of the public sector and facilitate government restructuring:

(1) A three-year hiring freeze, which has the potential to reduce the annual cost of public sector compensation by over \$2 billion in the third year of this legislation.

(2) A public sector wage freeze that would commence on the anniversary date of all contracts and continue for a three-year period from that date.

(3) Whistle-blower provisions to protect public servants who report fraud, waste and other abuses from workplace retribution, while netting substantial additional savings.

(4) Provisions to discourage government departments from spending their budgets within the fiscal year, eliminating year-end burnoff or face roll-backs.

(5) Performance bonuses for public servants based on the efficiencies and productivity gains similar to private sector agreements such as those involving the Canadian Auto Workers union.

(6) Establishment of an expenditure review committee to identify non-productive government programs and to prioritize existing programs.

If these sound, fair and effective management principles and measures were adopted, with attrition as a primary management tool, up to \$3 billion could be permanently removed from the public sector wage costs over three years.

Further, these guiding-principle solutions could be done without chaos and without retroactively cutting transfers or gutting collective agreements.

The PC Party believes that downsizing, while an important source of savings, is but one component in a broad, critical, strategic re-evaluation of the structures and function of government.

To assist in that process, the party has proposed the GVA procedure—government valuation assessment—which would establish a framework for the assessment and evaluation of government programs and functions in relation to clear and measurable criteria to determine, for example, whether a service could be more effectively and efficiently delivered by the private sector or the public sector.

The restructuring of the public sector must be based on a recognition that governments can no longer afford to be all things to all people, but must abandon those functions and services which analysis says it cannot deliver and can only deliver poorly and ensure that the services it does provide meet the strict value-for-money guidelines; not, for example, like the non-profit housing program which not only doesn't meet value-for-money guidelines; that minister in the Ministry of Housing cannot even tell the Provincial Auditor how much her program costs.

PC leader Mike Harris has said that downsizing the public sector is only half the answer to the economic challenge facing the province.

While the NDP government has made a small step in the direction of controlling public sector costs, it has done nothing to upsize the private sector, the other key component of an economic strategy, to ensure that this province has a future as prosperous as its past.

To enable Ontario to attract and retain job-creating investment, to exploit new market opportunities and to build a more entrepreneurial economy, the PC Party has called for: (1) the repeal on the NDP's job-killing labour laws, for example Bill 40; (2) a clear statement that wealth taxes will not be imposed in Ontario; (3) a small business exemption from the employer health tax—the employer health tax, I wish to point out, was an initiative of the previous Liberal government; (4) a competitive test for all new government taxes and regulations; (5) the implementation of an aggressive policy of privatization; (6) reforms of the workers' compensation system; and (7) a linkage between the welfare and skills training systems in the form of employer subsidies.

The PC Party believes it is essential that the government pursue policies which both upsize the private sector and downsize the public sector.

It's very difficult in the time available to us to talk about many of the other areas that this government needs advice and help with, but one comment I can't

leave unexpressed is that earlier tonight one of the government members—I can't, unfortunately, recall who it was that said it, but it was this evening, about the fact—actually, I think it was Irene Mathysen who said it, the member for—

**The Acting Speaker:** Middlesex.

2220

**Mrs Marland:** Middlesex. Thank you, Mr Speaker. She talked about this government reducing its budget \$4 billion last year and reducing it \$4 billion this year. I was in my office watching and I could hardly contain myself when I heard her say that, because Irene is a very nice person, and I'm sure the member for Middlesex, in all her innocence, actually believes what she said. She actually believes that this government reduced its spending \$4 billion last year and \$4 billion this year. It's so ludicrous that that is the line that this government's cabinet feeds to its backbenchers, because all that the member for Middlesex has to do is read Bill 17. She will find right away where some of that money is now not under the umbrella of the government expenditure; it's under a number of umbrellas, namely, crown corporations.

We now have the Ontario Financing Authority. We have the Ontario Transportation Capital Corp. We have the Ontario Clean Water Agency, the Ontario Realty Corp. How wonderful for this government to be able to say: "We've reduced our government spending. We've reduced our operating costs." What in fact they've done is an absolutely perfect example of the typical government shell game, where they've taken the expenditures out of this pocket so that they're not now listed in the budget that comes in that pocket, and they've put them in this pocket under crown corporations, at arm's length, nothing to do with them, not their expenditure, not their responsibility any more. Very clever, but not fooling the public and certainly not fooling the opposition. Unfortunately, it apparently fooled the member for Middlesex, because she actually believes what she said or else I'm sure she wouldn't have said it.

When we talk about crown corporations, I think it's a unique way for this government to say, "This is how we're going to save money." We've heard that this is the first government to balance the budget in 52 years, I think the Treasurer said a couple of weeks ago.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** Balance?

**Mrs Marland:** Pardon me, not balance the budget. Thank you. The member for Grey has corrected me. He said it's the first government to reduce government spending, isn't that what he said? Reduce government spending? That wouldn't be so scary if the member for Middlesex was saying that, but this is the Treasurer who's saying that. The Treasurer believes that.

I don't really want to get into the subject of non-profit housing, but it's very hard, as the shadow cabinet



person for Housing for our caucus, not to say something about it today. Today we did receive a report from Clayton Research Associates. They're an independent company that in fact, I understand, the Ministry of Housing itself often requests to handle its research. Today the Clayton Research report confirmed something that we in the Progressive Conservative caucus have been saying for the last three years, and that is that the non-profit housing program in this province is an absolute sham. It is not addressing the needs of people who need affordable housing.

What we are saying and have said for the last three years is that if you are really committed to looking after people in this province who need help with affordable housing—I may use this opportunity to emphasize that we in the Conservative Party are—then you do it in the most economical way to look after the largest number of people. What we're saying is, it's so archaic for the government to keep spending taxpayers' dollars building more and more government-owned and operated housing and all the capital investment that that involves, when all it has to do with the same amount of money is have a program of shelter allowances, which are direct shelter subsidies to the people who are eligible.

The advantage of direct shelter subsidies is that, first of all, we don't have to use the taxpayers' money to build the buildings that people will be housed in. If you don't have to do that, instead of subsidizing one unit to the extent of anywhere between \$900 and \$2,000 a month, you end up, for as little as \$114 a month, according to the Clayton Research study that came out today, being able to help people who are the working poor get out of that poverty level by giving them a shelter subsidy.

If you give a shelter subsidy directly to the person who is eligible, they then can use that money and choose where they live. They can use that money and reside near their work, near their babysitter, maybe near their family who help them with babysitting, or closer to transportation, which is another cost-saving factor for them. You give them all kinds of choices. Most importantly, you don't put them in a building with a label on it.

You see, the irony is that the whole non-profit housing program has been designed around trying to get away from the old Ontario Housing model, because we all know the problems that were associated with the ghettoizing of people into totally subsidized housing in an entire building, which the old Ontario Housing model was.

The non-profit housing program, which was started, incidentally, in Peel in 1975 by the Peel Non-Profit Housing Corp—I sat on their board in the 1970s as a member of council. It was the first non-profit housing corporation in Canada. Today, we still have the best-operated and -controlled buildings. But what is happen-

ing is that in order for non-profit housing programs not to have the stigma of the old Ontario Housing model, they have to have a percentage of rent-geared-to-income units and a percentage of market units. Now, the tremendous irony is that we have non-profit buildings in this province with vacancies, and guess what? This government is now spending thousands of dollars on advertising programs on how to rent these market-value units, these market-rent units in these government-owned buildings. You can be sure that if they don't get them rented, in order to balance their books in these non-profit housing corporations, they're going to have to raise the ratio of the rent-geared-to-income units, because they can't possibly leave these units empty. So eventually we're going to get back to the old Ontario Housing model where everybody is subsidized in the building.

What we're saying is, even with that program, we have a quarter of a million families in this province on waiting lists for affordable housing. What we're saying is, forget about the buildings and owning them and operating them and all the expense that's associated with that and deal directly with the people who need the help. Say to them: "If you're eligible for a subsidy, we will give you a shelter allowance and you can choose where you want to live. You don't have to live in a building with a label on it. Furthermore, we don't expect you to be ghettoized into a community where everybody is on assisted housing in one small community."

It's a very big subject, and even if this government didn't want to listen to us and what we've been saying for three years, I hope they will consider very closely the report that came out today from Clayton Research Associates, the same people they hire for a lot of their own information.

2230

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I'm glad to have this opportunity to spend a few moments commenting on what the member for Mississauga South had to say about the Clayton Research report. I'm sure that its authors, who were working in this instance for the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario, would nevertheless find her description of what the report says to be highly inaccurate.

She has made statements which must be corrected. There are not a quarter of a million people on waiting lists in this province. As the report indicates, quite correctly, there are over a quarter of a million households and people in this province in need of assistance with housing costs. They're not all on waiting lists for social housing. Those waiting lists are long, but they're not a quarter of million long.

What she is proposing out of the Clayton report is adding an add-on program to the existing programs of \$80 million in rent subsidy programming through the

Ministry of Housing and \$2.5 billion that's spent through social assistance for shelter allowances. Now she's going to add another program, which is generous of her, but I think we had better sit down and cost this out and figure out what is the best way of adding to the number of people who are going to get housing subsidies in Ontario. I think she would want to make sure she was going to cost out this add-on program she is proposing.

We are proposing to reform social assistance, and some of the ideas from the Clayton report are very useful to the consideration of how we should be reforming the social assistance system. If the member for Mississauga South would sit down and figure out the concepts involved, I'm sure she could help us in that discussion.

**Mr Offer:** I'd like to join in with the debate from the member for Mississauga South, because she has brought forward a number of very important points.

I think that in a two-minute wrapup, as members have at this point in time, we should tell it as it is, that much of Bill 48 is a result of the NDP's first budget in 1990. In 1990, when all other governments in this country recognized that we were in something much deeper than a recession, that something much more significant was going on, that something much broader was going on and that you couldn't spend your way out of whatever this recession or restructuring was, the NDP government in the province of Ontario did what no other jurisdiction in all of Canada, no matter what its political stripe was, did: It tried to spend its way out of something which it couldn't spend its way out of. As a result, there are many people today who are suffering from the mismanagement of the government of the day.

There is no question that Bill 48 is founded on chaos, is founded on inconsistency, is founded on total confusion. The reason for Bill 48 is not anything other than the first budget of the NDP government, which was to do what no other jurisdiction would even attempt to do, and that was to try to buy its way out of something that just couldn't happen. When the proper decisions, when the right decisions had to be made, the government failed. As a result, many people today are going to suffer. When those many people outside of this place come to the government and say, "Yes, we understand the need for restraint, we understand what a debt is, we understand what a deficit is and we have solutions to help, ways which will not devastate families," the government, as has been its custom from the day it was first elected, turns its back on these people.

**Mr Carr:** I'm pleased to add to the debate. I appreciate some of the comments from the member for Mississauga South. No matter what the people on the other side say, we are going to continue to give you the solutions that you need. I sat here a year ago when they said that they were going to spend their way out of it.

In spite of everything, we said: "No, do not do it. You can't continue to tax, spend and borrow like there's no tomorrow."

To hear the Minister of Housing a year later now getting up and trying to defend a program which the auditor, if you read the report—don't believe us; all you have to do is read the auditor's report—says is an absolute, overwhelming condemnation of non-profit housing in the province of Ontario, how this minister, day after day, can stand up and defend that waste when the cost is two and a half times what the private sector is—when you speak to all the housing, the non-profits, they say: "We're not that bad. It's the other guys who are bad. This one's bad, but we're okay." All that means is that somewhere out there there's even more abuse.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Now you are just being dishonest.

**Mr Carr:** As you go around and see the tremendous amount of waste at a time when we're laying off nurses, doctors and teachers, I say to this member, we're going to continue to hammer on it. When you look at programs, Ataritari will spend probably \$800 million and we won't have one new unit. For \$800 million, we bought a piece of land that can't be used for anything because of the environmental problems, and this minister stands up and thinks it's a good idea to build these units at a time when the private sector could do the job faster, better, cheaper, and know at what expense.

I say to the minister opposite that most of the people out here wouldn't mind cutting back on the public service if they thought you wouldn't blow the money on all your stupid programs, like non-profit housing. Quite frankly, day after day we've hit you with this problem, the auditors hit you and you continue to waste, but I say we're not going to give up. Eventually, we're going to hit you and get rid of these programs that are killing the province of Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Mahoney:** I find it unfortunate when a minister of the crown would shout across that a member here is being dishonest. I find that really a sad commentary on life in this Parliament.

But let me talk about the member for Mississauga South's speech, because it would be interesting for the Housing minister and all members to know how that member and many other members have arrived at a position of asking this government to revisit their Ontario Housing program or their—in fact, it is. That was a Freudian slip. That's exactly the problem: It is Ontario Housing.

The member for Mississauga South and I both used to sit on the board of Peel Non-Profit Housing Corp for some time.



**Mrs Marland:** I already said that.

**Mr Mahoney:** I know you said it, and I'm just repeating it. As a result of that, we worked at providing housing in the community. The ratio of subsidy was 25% and 75% were at market value. Then it went to 60-40. It was a reasonable split. The principle was that we're not going to create the ghettos and the slums that had been created by former governments. I won't mention the party. You know who they are. Former governments created the serious problems and we wanted a balance. We wanted a mix in the community.

Then the ratio increased to about—well, they call it 40-40-20; 40% deep subsidy, 40% shallow and 20% market. The reality is that it's becoming 100% subsidized. The whole principle has been thrown out the window. You're not helping the people who are moving in. You're not helping the people who need the help at a time when there is a higher rate of vacancy throughout the whole province than we've ever experienced. What we're asking for—you shake your head if you want—is for you to put a moratorium on it and revisit the issue. Quit being so stubborn. Maybe, just maybe you're wrong.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Mississauga South has two minutes to make a response.

**Mrs Marland:** I didn't know that the Minister of Housing was going to be here tonight and I didn't realize what a bonus it would be for me, because every time this minister comes into this House she reconfirms what we already know, which is that she does not have a clue what her non-profit housing program is about in this province.

She or her staff cannot even answer the questions of the Provincial Auditor. It wasn't me or the PC caucus who said last year that her Ministry of Housing non-profit housing program had lost \$200 million; it was the Provincial Auditor who pointed out there was \$200 million wasted and unaccountable. That is not a statement from a partisan opposition party. That is the Provincial Auditor. It's the Provincial Auditor who has asked her ministry for figures.

Do you know they can't even give the figures to the Provincial Auditor? They have no idea what this program costs in this province today. We have a guesstimate, and in our guesstimate all we're saying is that by the end of 1995, the taxpayers in this province will be subsidizing non-profit housing to the tune of \$2 billion a year. We're saying there's a better alternative.

I'm not asking this minister to spend more money on affordable housing. I'm just asking her to come forward and be honest and say: "We know there's a better way to do it. We can spend the same money and look after four times as many people." If you subsidize an apartment at \$1,900 a month at the same time that you can open the Toronto dailies and find an apartment for rent

at \$450 a month, which is the case of bachelor apartments they built last year for the subsidy of \$1,900 a month, we're saying it's outrageous, and there has to be an end to it.

2240

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** I'm pleased to participate in the debate this evening and happy to see so many of my colleagues here, smiles and in good spirits, to continue an important debate for this House and for the people of Ontario.

I think it's important, at least from my perspective, to try and get an understanding of what's happening, not only here in Ontario but right across the country, and some of the reasons for that as I see them and perhaps some of the potential solutions, which include the measures in Bill 48.

I think it's no secret that many provinces in this country are wrestling with deficits and wrestling with revenue problems right across the country. I'll try and be non-partisan in referring to the goods and services tax. You can be for it or against it. I happen to be against it. But I believe one thing that federal measure has done to each and every province in Canada is to severely affect its ability to raise revenue. The federal government has moved into an area of revenue-raising that has been traditionally one of the provinces', and many provincial programs have been funded across the country by that revenue source. In this province, it was no different. I think that has had a very serious impact on the economies of every province in Canada, including Ontario.

I think the other fundamental structuring issue that we need to pay some attention to is the industrial and economic restructuring that is under way in the province of Ontario and indeed is under way right across the country. There's no question in my mind, and I have been involved, at least in industry, for quite some time, that the changes that are taking place in this province are severe. They are not minor downturns, they are not blips on a chart, they are not minor variances along a path; it's a complete restructuring of the economic base of this country. In Ontario, I think it has an even greater impact than many other provinces in the country.

As you well know, Mr Speaker, and my colleagues in the House well know, we have a very strong manufacturing base in the province of Ontario, and one of the things that appears to be the latest trend in terms of Canada's economy, and indeed the world economy, is a trend away from the manufacturing sector and a rationalization of the manufacturing sector. I think that's had a very serious impact on the ability of Ontario to raise revenues, and to a lesser extent, depending on the involvement of the manufacturing industry in other provinces, the same is true.

I think that everybody in the House can agree that this province, and indeed other provinces and in fact the

federal government, are in a serious situation in dealing with deficit issues. If you look at the federal initiatives, when it was elected, it was a government that was elected to reduce the deficit. In their eight years in office, they haven't done much of a reduction in that deficit. I think, if memory serves me correctly, they've managed to achieve \$8 billion in savings over eight years. It's not a lot of money.

The goods and services tax, for example, was implemented to reduce debt, and they've championed the cause of reducing debt right across the country, and they haven't done so to any measurable amount. When you take \$8 million out of a debt the size of the federal debt, there isn't much there in terms of actual expenditure and debt reduction.

In the province of Ontario, because of the revenue issues, because of the economic restructuring issues, because of a very serious recession—indeed some have termed it a depression—there's no question that we need to get our financial house in order. It's in the best interests of everybody in this province, whether you are a public sector employer, whether you are a public sector employee, whether you are a consumer of public services, of what we hold very dear to us in terms of a standard of public service and a standard of public programs that sets this country and this province apart from others.

It's clear to me that the very future of those programs, the delivery of those services, is at risk unless there are some serious looks at how we deliver those services. How much do they cost? How do we deal with the revenue issues? Are the right services being delivered by the right people? Is the money being spent as cost-effectively as it can?

I heard earlier today from the member for York Centre, who would have me believe that there is nothing wrong with the education system in the province of Ontario, there is nothing wrong with the education system in any other province in the country, there is nothing wrong with the health care system, nothing needs to be fixed. Frankly, that's contrary to what I hear on a daily basis from many people right across the broad spectrum of both those sectors in Ontario, that indeed there are positive changes that should be made.

I'm somewhat dismayed by the approach of the Liberal Party on these particular initiatives and on this particular issue, in that I hear from several members from that party that there are no problems, there is nothing that needs to be done, everything is going to go along just the way it always did. I find that, although dismayed by it, not surprising because I think, during the period of 1985 to 1990, they certainly had an enthusiasm for spending.

They also had the revenues of a very good economy during those five years, and they would have me believe that they were somehow responsible for that. I happen

to believe that they simply rode the waves of a very good economic time. I guess it's a question of responsible fiscal management. I know we are criticized from the Liberal Party that we are not able to responsibly manage an economy.

I would suggest to you that the Liberal Party, in all those good years, raising taxes as many times as it did, having the revenues that it did in a very boisterous industrial economy, would have put a dime away for a rainy day. That didn't happen and it's raining today. These are problems that I think we need to deal with, all of us in this House. It doesn't serve much purpose to point fingers, and I'm doing my best not to.

**Mr Offer:** Is that why your hands are folded?

**Mr Huget:** Yes, it's why my hands are folded. I'm simply relaying what I know to be the situation over the last four or five years. I think that we need to pay some attention to the criticism from the Conservative Party as well. This is a party which again would have me believe that they have the answers to managing an economy. They are the same Conservative Party that is involved and responsible for managing the federal debt. They are the same Conservative Party which, for example, in the province of Saskatchewan took a balanced budget and in two years arrived at a \$20-billion debt.

That, to me, I guess perhaps means a little more than most people because it's a province that I was born in and I have some knowledge of the situation in Saskatchewan. Under a Conservative government in Saskatchewan that \$20-billion debt was racked up in eight years and it's a serious problem for that province because they have a population of approximately one million people. Less than 400,000 of those work, and those 400,000 people are saddled with a \$20-billion debt.

In my estimation, they'll pay off a little bit at a time for about two generations or three generations, so I always take the Conservative Party's comments on fiscal management with a bit of a grain of salt. They have not got, quite frankly, the track record that they would allude to or suggest that they have. When you look at the federal Conservative policies in terms of debt reduction, they have been failures. When you look at the province of Saskatchewan, which had a balanced budget under an NDP government for 11 years, and inherited a balanced budget, they are now in that \$20-billion debt situation. So I have to have some reservations about the Conservative Party having all the answers.

2250

But I guess more to the point, and Bill 48, what we've tried to do in this province is approach in a responsible way a very serious issue that I believe threatens the survival of programs and services. We've done as much as we can, in fact indeed more than any other government in this province's history, to actually



reduce government expenditures. We've taken \$4 billion out of government expenditure programs. That's a significant amount of money by anybody's estimation. We thought that to simply take it out of government programs was not entirely fair; to take it simply from the taxpayer was not entirely fair; to take it simply from the public sector and its employees was not entirely fair.

So we have tried to proceed with what we think is a balanced and a fair approach. We've taken \$4 billion out of program expenditures, we're going to raise another \$2 billion through revenue increases and tax increases and we've asked the public sector and the public service to take a little bit less, to the tune of approximately \$2 billion, to be the third prong of that three-pronged approach. We think it's that balanced approach that's in the best interests of all the people of Ontario, including the public sector and the public service aspect of the Ontario economy.

I think that it's easy to criticize if you are charged with no other responsibility than to criticize. I know that all of those in opposition, although I have not had the privilege of sitting in this House in opposition, have as their prime purpose, I suppose, to make sure that there is the necessary criticism levelled at the government of the day. But I believe it may be in the best interests of the people of Ontario and the public sector in Ontario that we perhaps move past that partisan approach and look at the problem in its proper perspective and look at the solution in its proper perspective.

I know it has been referred to several times this evening and over the course of other debates about the advertising campaign on the social contract, as it's referred to by the opposition at least, and the fact that we should not be communicating that message. Well, we think these are very important issues, and we think they're very important not only to the public service but they're very important to the public interest.

That communication needs to be done in a fashion that people get information that is accurate and timely rather than interpretations of information by opposition parties, which may wish to put, if you will, their spin on what's going on and communicate that to people in the province. I don't find that acceptable either. I don't find playing politics with a very serious situation to be in anybody's interest.

I think there's no question many of us on this side of the House have had to wrestle with these decisions for a long time. They have not been easy decisions to make, and they will continue to be difficult decisions to make. I think the measures we've announced in terms of the program reductions and expenditure reductions, the tax issues and now the social contract, will move us towards the end of a path, but I don't think it, by any stretch of the imagination, will take us there entirely.

I think every level of government, the federal level, the provincial level and the municipal level, will be

under continuing pressure, both now in the short term and in the long term, to make sure that the services we deliver, as delivered by the public sector, are delivered in the most cost-efficient, effective way they can be delivered. There is, I believe, a situation that all government representatives from all levels of government are experiencing, and that is a great deal of concern from their constituents about the delivery of government services.

What I find interesting, particularly in the area of education, is that although people are concerned about the amount of dollars that are going into the education system, they very much want to ensure that their children have the best quality of education that's available to them. If they are convinced that the money that's allocated to education and funding in the province of Ontario is spent in the best possible way and the most cost-effective, efficient way, they're prepared to accept that.

I think the restructuring that is under way in the private sector can be compared to the restructuring that will have to go under way in the public sector. The private sector has reorganized the way it does business for a very simply reason: It had, in some cases, lost its competitive edge. It found that the old pyramid structures, the old structures of doing business and the old structures of how systems worked weren't responsive enough to allow it to remain competitive. Therefore it wasn't, I don't believe, out of the goodness of anyone's heart that they changed; it was simply a matter of competitiveness.

I think the delivery of public services can be looked at in somewhat the same way, although they are clearly different issues, but I think the approaches could be viewed as similar. I think there's a lot more room for the streamlining of government services. I think there's a lot more room for people at the bottom of that pyramid to be empowered to take more of their worklife into their own hands.

After all, if we ask public servants to make decisions at work, then surely we can ask public servants to make decisions about the way in which that work is structured and about the way it's performed. I think there are tremendous initiatives that could be undertaken in those areas to streamline and flatten out the government structure so that indeed we do achieve the necessary, I believe, efficiencies in streamlining and productivity improvements that all of us will have to see. Otherwise, I fear that public services themselves will be threatened, and I think that's a far less palatable alternative.

I think as well there have been many comments, certainly not from this side of the House but from the other side of the House, about the will to public-service-bash and take on the public service in the province of Ontario. I want to assure you, Mr Speaker, and members of this House, that I have not heard during all these

deliberations, from anyone on this side of the House, a single derogatory statement about a public servant in the province of Ontario. I have not heard a single statement that would suggest for a moment that the government is attacking the public service.

I, like some members of the opposition, am very disappointed about the public reaction to what they perceive as perhaps an opportunity to grind an axe with somebody they may have wanted to grind an axe with in the public service over the years. That's very unfortunate, because it certainly is no one's intent. There are public servants in this province at all levels who do a tremendous job, always have and always will.

I think it's interesting, from my perspective, to understand that there isn't a public servant in the province who wants to go out and do an inefficient, cost-inefficient job. That's just not the way they are. In my experience anyway, they've wanted to do the best job they could. However, in some cases the system doesn't allow them to do that.

*Laughter.*

**Mr Huget:** I was distracted by the laughter over there. I somewhat regret that I am not privy to the joke; however, I can only hope that I'm not the joke. It is a serious issue and I can appreciate that it's late in the evening and people may be a little bit giggly, but I really think it's an important issue and it should get the respect it deserves.

In any event, again I want to make sure that people fully understand that the public service in this province is not the enemy. I'm interested by the Conservative leader's approach to the public service over the last couple of years that I've been here. He's been much harsher than certainly I could even imagine. He has suggested I guess many times that his answer would be much more severe than ours.

What we've done in attempting to deal with this entire public sector issue through a social contract approach was to do exactly the opposite of what Liberals and Conservatives would do. We are very proud of the fact and have wrestled a great deal with the approach to make sure that we are fair and balanced in our approach with the public sector.

I think this government has got an obligation to the people of Ontario, including the public sector, including the public service, but also including the public interest. We were, in my opinion, elected to protect and preserve all three of those, not the least of which is the public interest.

2300

I believe that if we choose a course of non-action at this particular point in time, the result of not taking any action whatsoever would be very, very detrimental to the future of this province and its public services and its programs, and no doubt would be very detrimental to

the future generations that have to come along. I refer specifically to the Saskatchewan example, where I believe firmly that many generations will be paying off that debt.

I want to make it clear that the Ontario government is keeping an eye on the debt because we'd rather spend public dollars on job creation and on services like health care and education than on interest payments. If we didn't, the province would continue to see a massive transfer of its wealth from average Ontarians to bond holders, many of whom live outside Canada. I think that's important when you look at the level of borrowing that this province does and where we borrow it, the fact that not very much of it, I believe, is borrowed within Canada and not very much in North America. The debt problems and the public debt interest are significant financial problems for us and a significant financial windfall for people in Zurich and Tokyo and London and New York. Frankly, if we're dealing with public money, in my humble opinion that money is much more advantageous to the people of Ontario if it's here in Ontario rather than being transferred overseas in the form of public debt interest.

In closing, I'd like to say that the measures being implemented through this legislation were tabled at the previous social contract negotiations. They represent the fairest way to achieve the government's \$2-billion target while preserving jobs and services. The legislation encourages the social contract partners at the sector and local levels to negotiate ways to achieve their savings targets. The deadline for those negotiations, as we all know, is August 1. On that date, the legislation imposes measures to achieve the savings targets if the parties—and I have to stress, if the parties—have not agreed. This is part of the government's fair and balanced plan to control the debt in order to invest in jobs and services. The other components of the plan have already been implemented. We've cut spending by \$4 billion and increased tax and non-tax revenues by \$2.7 billion.

The social contract legislation is about a framework for sector and local negotiations between employers and workers. It's about achieving greater productivity and efficiency in the delivery of public services. It has in it very progressive measures on job security. It ensures that low-income public sector employees are not affected. And it has firm deadlines and realistic objectives.

We on this side of the House believe these measures will help to put Ontario back on track and will help to preserve and ensure quality public services in the province of Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable member for Sarnia for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Elston:** Listening to the member for Sarnia, I



couldn't help but think that this, like that of so many of the other members over there, must be quite a turnaround from where they used to spend most of their time in advocating for various things to occur, generally in respect of collective bargaining and other activities resulting in higher wages and a whole series of better benefits and better working conditions for the people who were working in the union movement. I understand that the member has been very active in his home community. I know his record has been an enviable one as he's asserted the rights of working people in Sarnia. I can't help but ask myself how it is that there has come to be so much of a change in the way that party now approaches government.

I'm not trying to be mischievous really, because I have seen so many of the people there through the years, as a minister at one point, but as a brand-new member from 1981 to 1985. In my first term I sat in the justice committee and dealt with Bills 179 and 111 which, you may recall, were the Davis government's attempts at controlling the escalation of wages. In those days, and I think I'm right, the one amount was 6% and the other amount was 5% hikes in the wage rates for those years 1981 and 1982.

The New Democrats were the ones who pushed and screamed and yelled the loudest, I think, although some of us Liberals who were there also took exception to the fact that collective agreements were being opened up; in fact, in many ways were being terminated and recast by this legislation brought on by Davis and his colleagues. It was defended in those days by the Tories as being necessary. Now the New Democrats as government are defending this vile turnaround as necessary because they are government.

**Mrs Marland:** I welcome the opportunity to comment on the member for Sarnia's 30-minute speech. I noticed there was an absolute dearth of any reference to a very major budget item of your government, that being the non-profit housing program. I think it's a little unfortunate that you chose not to speak about non-profit housing, because that is going to be one of the biggest millstones around the neck of your government in the next two years that you remain in office. It certainly will be an issue when you run for election. By that time, people will understand just how serious it is in terms of the ongoing legacy of your government, the colloquialism that is often used about shopping with our grandchildren's and our great-grandchildren's credit cards. The non-profit housing program in this province is not a solution.

For a party which always proclaimed when it was in opposition that it wanted to look after those people in our society who need support, we are completely disappointed, because there are programs we would initiate where we would fulfil our responsibility in society.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Spend, spend, spend; another add-on program.

**Mrs Marland:** The Minister of Housing says, "Spend, spend, spend." It's almost criminal for that minister to say we are suggesting spend, spend, spend. What we're saying is, use the money wisely and look after four times as many people.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I just wanted to get up and say to the members of the House and those watching that once in a while it's good to see somebody stand in their place, like the member for Sarnia did, and talk about the difficult situation we're in, how we're grappling with it. Give us a little bit of understanding, because it's too easy to get wrapped up in the rhetoric of this place.

It's important that the viewers at home who have a chance to see this realize that this is something that is very difficult for a lot of members to deal with. Of course, the opposition members keep saying, "It's shameful for you from the trade union movement to be doing such a thing" like offering a collective bargaining process to people to work through this process.

2310

The member for Sarnia said it quite well this evening about the very difficult process we're going through. He talked about the need for the collective bargaining to continue. It would have been easier, I suppose, if we were opposition members, to stand back and say, "This isn't collective bargaining," but the fact is that we've extended the deadline. The unions walked away from the table, which disappointed an awful lot of us. We all got phone calls back in our constituency offices about this. In fact, many of us were even picketed. But when we had a chance to talk to some of those people, a lot of them didn't even know exactly what was on the table and what was even being talked about.

The member for Sarnia talked about that and explained the issue in far greater detail, of course, than the rhetoric we've heard. All we've heard is, "We told you that you shouldn't spend the money," and then they stand up in question period and say, "Why don't you give me some more money for this program?" That's a darn shame, because it just adds to the cynicism out there.

I want to commend the member for Sarnia because he got up, he stood in his place and talked about exactly the difficult situation we're in and explained the process quite well.

**Mr Offer:** I'd like to respond to the statement from the member for Sarnia. It is just a little bit tough to take, and I'll tell you why it's a little bit tough to take.

It wasn't more than a year ago that this Legislature was debating Bill 40, the changes to the Ontario Labour Relations Act, and the member for Sarnia not only took part in that debate but also was on the committee that

looked into Bill 40 and the amendments to the Ontario Labour Relations Act. As he was in favour of that act and I stood opposed, that member would say how important it is to protect the collective bargaining agreements.

**Mr Stockwell:** Who said that?

**Mr Offer:** The member for Sarnia said, day in and day out, that what is required is a framework that ensures a smooth collective bargaining process that protects the rights of workers, that enshrines in legislation, if not an awareness, at the very least a feeling of justification so that there will be real ongoing bargaining between workers and management, that this is how we are going to build the province. I was opposed to the bill because I believe it took away rights of workers, but the member, day in and day out, said how important it was.

Now the member speaks about cynicism on the part of the general public about government. I must say, with all due respect, it is a real stretch to listen to the member speak about Bill 48 today and about Bill 40 nine months ago. Believe me, it is like day and night.

**The Speaker:** The member for Sarnia has up to two minutes for his response.

**Mr Huget:** I listened very carefully to the comments of my colleagues on the other side of the House and to the member for Mississauga North. I would have to say that while he may find this a stretch for his imagination, I certainly find his position on this bill a stretch for my imagination.

When it comes to working people in this province, I am particularly proud of what we've been able to achieve for working men and women in this province. He refers to the Ontario Labour Relations Act, and he's quite right, I'm very proud of that act and very proud that bill was passed. I want to remind people in this province that this member's party and the other party were opposed to that legislation and, I imagine, continue to oppose it. In fact, the Conservative Party, as I understand it, would repeal it.

We put wage protection programs in place in this province that weren't there before. We've initiated the Ontario investment and employee ownership program. We're dealing with pay equity, we are dealing with employment equity and we're dealing with the minimum wage. We're doing what previous governments in this province ignored, and those are the issues that affect working men and women in this province and they were ignored by those people during their terms of office.

I have to tell you that I do indeed have great faith in the collective bargaining process. I've spent quite some time in my life dealing in that process, and I take offence at someone who would suggest that they know what I would feel like as a trade unionist, because they

wouldn't; they're not. I simply have more faith in the system than they do.

This bill will allow negotiations if people wish to negotiate, and I believe that there are responsible people in this province who will come to the table and negotiate. I am not nearly as sceptical or cynical as the members across the way. When I want to get advice about negotiations, I'll ask someone else. In my view, the opposition parties could not negotiate a trip to the washroom.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I'd like to pick up where the previous member left off by indicating that few people could negotiate as the current government has negotiated. I think he's correct in that. I think the record will show that no provincial government in the modern period has ever been forced to introduce a bill of this kind. I think you'd probably have to go back to the latter years of the late, great Mitchell Hepburn to find something akin to Bill 48.

I've been listening to the debate for the last couple of days, I've been watching this striptease over the course of the last number of weeks and I'm going to try to take a somewhat different tack than a number of the previous speakers, because I have to believe that for people watching this debate out there it must become very tiresome to hear a kind of round-robin blame society. To listen to the New Democrats complain about the federal Tories, to listen to the Tories blame the provincial Liberals, to hear the Liberals complain about themselves perhaps, I don't really think advances the cause, at least for my constituents.

I will say that I had an interesting experience the other night. I called a town hall meeting in the city of Pembroke on Thursday night for purposes of a discussion of the social contract. I had 150 people come out to essentially berate me for some of the things that I said in support of the difficult situation in which we now find ourselves and for which, in a sense, we're all responsible. I want to be very clear about that: Each of us in our own way, I think, has some measure of blame for the current situation.

I think it is not unreasonable to say that the incumbent government, charged with the responsibilities of office for some almost 32 months now, has some particular responsibility, because it has been the superintendent of public finances in this province during the course of the last three years when there has been a very significant, measurable decline in economic activity and revenues to the provincial treasury. One did not need to be a rocket scientist to see how \$45 billion worth of revenue became \$43 billion worth of revenue, which became \$41 billion worth of revenue.

I think the experience of the Rae government appears now to parallel the Mitterrand government which, in the



early 1980s, took office in another place, faced something of the same kind of economic situation and decided for the first two and a half years of its mandate to spend its way out of the recession. It was not able to do so and then embarked upon a very different course which in some ways—in others it doesn't, but in some ways—parallels the action of the Ontario New Democratic government.

I say to my friends on behalf of my constituents, who said to me the other night that they're really tired of all the blame, they're tired of panaceas, they're now all from Missouri, they're very, very sceptical, they don't believe very much of what any of us has to say, that we've all managed, in our own way, to debase the political currency to quite a spectacular level, and the Clinton administration, among others, seems to be continuing that pattern. I sit and I listen and, boy, I'll tell you, I'm impressed by the fact that some very thoughtful people in this place continue to offer things that are manifestly impossible. I would really invite people to think twice about doing that, because we all have some very, very difficult choices to face, we've got some very painful medicine to administer and the patient is showing signs of restlessness and worse that give me some very real pause.

2320

I shouldn't just characterize my meeting the other night as a meeting where I was condemned by everyone, although I was showing my friend from Bruce the headlines in the Pembroke paper of Friday, June 18, "Conway Blasted on Social Contract." It goes on for several paragraphs to highlight some of the testimony that was offered by largely public sector union leadership at that meeting, which felt very, very deeply aggrieved by what the Rae government had done and is doing with this policy and especially with Bill 48.

There were obviously a goodly number of people at my meeting who did not speak in the public session but indicated to me afterwards, as public servants or as citizens working outside of the public sector, a willingness to rethink the way in which we do business in the province and understanding that we've reached a point where we are going to have to, as the member for Sarnia indicated, do some things differently. I think that there is a very broad base of support in the community for some of what the government wants to do.

To be sure, I probably could entertain the House better than most people about how Bill 48 is a transparent prostitution by any social democratic government in this province. When I think that Bob Rae has authored this—I've heard Bradley and I've heard others, but who needs it? I wouldn't for a moment visit the kind of, to quote Irving Layton, "nauseous crapperoo" that characterized Bob Rae for so many years as he excoriated governments of a Liberal or a Tory stripe for their manifest deficiencies.

Those of us who have been here a while and remember the speeches of the NDP back in 1976, when the Davis government had opted into the Trudeau anti-inflation legislation—was anybody around? There probably isn't anybody here who remembers, though. It was something to hear Stephen Lewis and Jim Renwick and all of those people. Bud Wildman was here; as I recall, he was very busily attending to his electoral fences back in Algoma since the Tories were determined, in the election that was expected any day then, to get him out of here. But I'll tell you, I remember the speeches that were offered at that time about just how incredibly unjust this was from that great democrat Pierre Trudeau, and now of course, 17 or however many years later, we have Bill 48 authored by, as my friend from Etobicoke West likes to say, Robert K. Rae QC.

But as I say, blaming people at this point doesn't satisfy me and, more importantly, doesn't do my constituents any good whatsoever. I think it is fair to say that we really have turned a page, and I think our political culture's changed more dramatically in the last few months and perhaps the last year than it's changed in my almost 20 years here now. I'm detecting things in my community and in my own family that were unthinkable two or three years ago. The level of pain, the level of anguish, the level of uncertainty caused by the current restructuring, depression, economic upset—call it what you will—is unprecedented in my adult life. There are people in all walks of life, in all communities in this province and country and in much of the developed world today who are apparently prepared to throw overboard some of the verities of the last 50 years.

I see in Japan there are some revolutionary things happening to the governing political élite there. The Italians have decided the time has come to throw overboard a lot of their political conventions. We have a Tory party in this country that has just chosen a sharp-tongued female from Vancouver as its leader and Prime Minister. That indicates to me that times have changed in ways that might not have been imagined just 5 or 10 years ago.

I look at Bill 48 and ask myself, how did we get here? Well, we got here through a variety of ways and means. It was, and I've said this before—I was interested to hear my friend the member for Mississauga South opine earlier tonight about the particular virtues of her ideological offerings. I would only say to her that in 1975, when I came here, on an expenditure plan of I think it was \$12 billion, the sainted Darcy McKeough had a deficit of \$2 billion. Mr Speaker, you might remember that. Can you imagine a \$2-billion deficit on a \$12-billion expenditure plan in the salad years of the mid-1970s? That happened. It happened here. I often think to myself today, how did the sainted Duke of Kent, W. Darcy McKeough, ever get that budget through a Tory cabinet? I know how he got it through

a Tory cabinet. They were on the eve of an election they were expecting to lose, rather like—do you remember Frank Miller's June 4, 1985, offering to this assembly? I remember it well.

**Mrs Marland:** I remember it, because I was in the government then.

**Mr Conway:** Indeed. I would say to my friend from Mississauga, if that June 4 speech from the throne is something you really believed in—

**Mrs Marland:** I moved it.

**Mr Conway:** You moved it. Well, then, I can only say this: I think it was Oscar Wilde who once observed that all saints have a past and all sinners have a future, because that June 4, 1985, document was quite a special piece, and for people to stand here today and say, "We're without sin in these matters," is I think a bit precious. To be ecumenical about this, there is no doubt that the Peterson government, of which I was a part, cranked up spending to a level that could not be sustained in anything but extremely expansionary times.

Having said that, I looked around my meeting the other night at a number of the people who were there and condemning the Rae government and who then said, "You people"—meaning Peterson, Conway et al who were in government 1985-90—"spent money like drunken sailors." I looked at some of these people and I thought, and I said, "Well, I remember a couple of efforts, not particularly heroic ones, by myself and my ministerial colleagues in the late 1980s to turn down spending." I looked at this room, and I saw some very people there in that room Thursday night who were determined not to let those expenditure controls take effect, and the teacher leadership and others won the day, game, set and match. At the risk of being a little bit confessional, to see Bob Rae in Bill 48 dip into the teachers' pension fund to provide for the discounts on expenditure control—

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** It doesn't do that.

**Mr Conway:** Oh, it doesn't. I mean, I just have to say, who would have thought that possible? I see my friend the member from north Hastings here, and he will remember those passionate debates of the late 1980s in the staff rooms in Bancroft and Madoc and elsewhere and that rotten Nixon, that corrupt Peterson, that obsequious Conway, who sought to "steal from our pensions." Remember those debates? And I give the teacher leadership credit: game, set and match.

Well, four years later, we face now some intrusions into those worlds that were, by the standards of the late 1980s, unthinkable. Sometimes victories are pyrrhic. Sometimes victories are painful and pyrrhic, and I think back to some of the victories of five years ago in which honourable members opposite participated gleefully. And they helped. They certainly helped to bring us to this point.

Having indicated that, however, I think we do have to recognize as a community that for the time being at least the salad days are over. We have reached the limits of growth. I don't know whether people read these budget documents very carefully, but it is interesting to see—

**Mr Stockwell:** Gerry does.

**Mr Conway:** My friend is right. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt reads them very carefully. But it is very interesting to me to look at the budgetary figures for the last three years to see something unprecedented in the last 50 years, and that is three years in which government revenues have declined significantly and steadily. That is a very un-Ontario kind of fiscal reality, and I don't think a lot of people inside this place and a lot of people outside of this place have yet understood that reality. Sure there are speeches given about, "We've reached the limits of growth." Well, we have. Oh, we have in a big way reached the limits of growth, and it is now going to mean something very, very significant to all of us.

We developed in this jurisdiction in the last 20 years a number of entitlement programs. My favourite is the Ontario drug benefit program. I say for the benefit of my friend from Bruce, who would have thought possible just a couple of years ago that the day would arise when almost by executive fiat the Minister of Health would stand up and say, "I'm going to take 15% of the funding out of that entitlement program in one year"?

2330

I remember when Bill Davis tried that about 10 years ago, and he tried much, much less than that, and I'll tell you, he was chased back into the tent so fast that he never opened his mouth on the subject ever again in the course of his premiership.

Now we have the very heroic member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, and she is going to strip \$195 million this year out of that entitlement program. Bonne chance, I say to my friend the minister, bonne chance. She'll need that and a lot of prayers. But it's a good example of an entitlement program designed 20 years ago—I shouldn't say "designed"—fundamentally flawed in its design at conception 20 years ago. The current government is going to face the wrath of every senior citizen in this province before the winter snows fall on the green grass of Ontario in 1993 in this particular respect.

Somebody said it in the course of this debate and I agree: The real dynamite is not in Bill 48; it's in Bill 50 and in some ways, Tories and Liberals will be able to, for a long time to come, point to this year as a watershed in the Ontario political history of this province because the Rae government is going to visit some of the most unthinkable medicine upon the Ontario electorate, and it will make the opportunities for a new government in 1995 or 1997 or 1999, I think, considerably more wide than they might otherwise have been.



But I simply say that we have recognized that we can't go on as we have. I accept my responsibility in this regard, though I have tried, sometimes unsuccessfully, to indicate that certain of our spending plans were not sustainable. I spent some time after the meeting on Thursday night with people in other parts of my constituency and the level of hurt, the level of despair, is really now starting to have an effect on me.

I have never in 18 years felt, as I have in the last few months, the sense that there's just something wrong and something profoundly out of whack, the number of people out there who feel that their job, their kid's job, their entire economic prospect is about to wash away. When they look to the legislative debate, when they look to the panoply of government, in many ways they've yet to see a recognition that people inside that protected shell, and it is still a relatively protected shell, understand the pain and the pressure outside.

I simply want to make the point that in talking to people in my area, farmers, loggers, small business people, none of whom are making any money, they're all just hanging on by their fingertips. Now I see tonight on the national news that very good economic indicators out of Statistics Canada are suggesting that the recovery is gathering steam.

**Mr Carr:** Boy, that Kim Campbell works quickly.

**Mr Conway:** The member for Oakville South says, "Boy, that Kim Campbell works quickly." My constituents hope that she turns her attention from the demons of the papacy to the demonic elements of the international economic disorder.

**Mr Carr:** Till Audrey takes over?

**Interjection:** You guys don't believe that.

**Mr Stockwell:** And that's as long as you keep your official party status.

**Mr Conway:** I will only make this point, that some one of us will be fortunate enough to win the responsibility of government in a few years. It's going to be a joy, it's going to be just the lottery prize to beat all lottery prizes. I look at Bill 48 and boy, what a Trojan Horse. The very quiet and measured Minister of Housing makes her parenthetical observations about what's in it and what's not in it. I just have to tell you that at my meeting on Thursday night, there were people who were at the social contract talks. Boy, I haven't heard in this assembly anybody as critical and as damning of those talks as that woman from the allied health group who was at the Pembroke meeting the other night, and she said she was at the talks.

I look at section 26 of this bill and, boy, that's a Trojan Horse if ever I saw one. Let me be frank: I think what the government has tried to do here is quite interesting. The whole notion of trying to bring the partners together in this kind of a dialogue is something that—I guess it was the minister of highways who said

it was not done in Quebec, it was not done in Newfoundland, it was not done in Alberta. I guess it hasn't been done in too many places, so I give the government full credit for trying.

All I say is that the process began on April 23, a month into the fiscal year. The bill is introduced on June 14. The talks are going to be allowed to continue, really, to August 10. We've got municipalities and school boards that are half or more through their year. I say to my friends, get a life. If you've ever had to manage any of these accounts, you know the sheer impossibility of what this process supposes and demands for year one. I can't support this bill because I think that particularly in terms of year one, it is totally unworkable. My guess is that you will be extremely lucky to achieve about 35% to 40% of the "savings."

Now, the Minister of Agriculture and Food shakes his head disapprovingly. He may be right, but I talked to my municipal clerks the other day. They just got the list from Municipal Affairs and they are all absolutely stupefied, trying to figure out, "Where did this stuff come from?" Now they're trying to take those numbers and fit them into the provincial criteria: Thou shalt do this, this, this and this and achieve these kinds of savings. One would have to be a magician of the kind I think found only at Gananoque last weekend to effect that kind of result.

But I simply want to say that I, on behalf of my constituents, feel that I have a mandate here to support government in a restraint position today and well into the remaining years of this decade, because it's not clear that we have very much of an alternative.

It's interesting to me when I look at the budgetary charts. Looking at the expenditure line in the 1993-94 budget, it's astonishing to realize that debt servicing costs annually in 1991 for the province of Ontario were \$4.2 billion, and this year, two years later, they're going to be \$7.2 billion. So that means that in just two years, I think, we've got about a \$3-billion increase annually in debt servicing.

I see the Minister of Community and Social Services. Somebody told me the other day that the provincial share of social welfare had risen in three years from about \$3 billion to about \$6 billion.

**Hon Richard Allen (Minister without Portfolio in Economic Development and Trade):** That's 2.6 to 6.2.

**Mr Conway:** That was the number I heard. I just want everybody to think about this: In a revenue pie that is shrinking significantly, two items, debt servicing and the provincial share of social assistance, have added over \$6.4 billion annually to the cost of doing business. Well, my friends, we'd just better understand that there are a lot of things that are no longer possible. Because I am a Liberal, I believe that we have got to provide a

reasonable social safety net to people who are being disadvantaged and dislocated, but listening to this debate between members on all sides about the social housing policies, my impression—it's not a big deal in Renfrew, but my impression is that, yes, the train has come off the track.

I've only got anecdotal evidence. I repeat that we've got to provide a good level of social security, but if the anecdotal evidence I'm hearing in the small towns of my constituency is at all creditable, I've got a problem as a small-I liberal and large-I Liberal, because those are programs I want to defend, but I can only defend them if they are seen by individuals in the community as being credible.

I accept that there's always going to be a measure of abuse. My friend Mr McGuinty put out a release the other day just reminding everybody that according to Revenue Canada, 25% of all Canadians cheat on their income tax filings. That's an interesting statistic, if true.

2340

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** That's nothing new.

**Mr Conway:** It's nothing new, of course, but I'm just making the point that the public finances of this province are in extremis, and the tax hit hasn't even arrived. Wait; wait for three weeks. I'm going to hide at my cottage for the last half of July because I don't want to meet the people who are going to be paying the additional \$2.3-billion tax and fee increase. They are going to be unhappy.

I'll tell you, some of the people who are going to get hit hardest are the ones at my meeting the other night blasting me about the social contract. The nurse-high school teacher combination in places like Bancroft and Barry's Bay and Pembroke, oh, they are going to know Conway's and Buchanan's phone number by August 1, because making the rich pay is going to make those people pay. They're going to know that Elmer and I have been down here doing good works for the common wealth, you betcha. I tell you, I don't expect to be invited to too many garden parties this summer.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** You can come to Manitouwadge. You are welcome.

**Mr Conway:** I have no desire to go to Manitouwadge this summer. I intend to stay at home, because, I'll tell you, we are not, any of us, I think going to be very popular. We're not going to be very popular, any of us.

I simply make the observation that an old order has passed. Much of our old political culture has passed, in my view. I personally believe that we are going to be fundamentally re-examining a number of commitments. Bill 48 already does it for me. This is ground-breaking legislation. I understand why the government has had to do it. I don't like it. I'm sure the government doesn't like it. But I don't see that we've got very much choice.

The criticism that I would level against the government is that, with the best of intentions, they waited too long before they moved. They waited about 18 months too long. I think I can understand why they might have temporized, but temporize they did, and the price will now be paid.

But let there be no confusion: The way in which we have engaged in political debate and made policy in this province, whether you are a true Progressive Conservative, a traditional Liberal or a social democrat, the sun has set on most of that. It may be that the centre left is going to be so discredited that the only alternative that is going to appeal to people is some kind of a Preston Manning, right-wing alternative. Watching the Ralph Klein victory the other night, and I watched it all, I thought to myself that's not impossible.

I would simply say, though, that as we look at public expenditures in the coming months and years, we are going to have to be as good as some of our rhetoric, because I continue to see in my own constituency an active interventionist government raining programs and raining money on my constituents' heads in a way that is not going to be very well received and not very helpful. Because, you see, there is a very real dissonance; people read the Saturday Pembroke Observer or the Saturday Ottawa Citizen and see the big ad, and I might be a bit heretical in saying this, but they sort of say, "Yeah, Bob, I think you're right." Then they pick up another paper and Bud Wildman or Marilyn Churley or Tony Silipo announces the following, and some of it looks like harebrained nonsense.

**Interjection:** That's all of them.

**Mr Conway:** I'm sure in individual packages it's all wonderful stuff, but there is a very real dissonance between the main message and the individual pieces. It's a criticism not just of the government, because it's certainly a criticism of any of us who now keep going back to a well and saying—Mike Harris has a great line. He once said to me, "Well, I know it's kind of wasteful, but Nipissing deserves its share of the government's waste." I think I quote him almost precisely.

I hope that's just a bit of rhetoric and not any kind of serious offering, because I never thought I'd see the day that Bill 48 would be introduced by a social democratic government in this province. I will support the underlying ambitions of the policy, because we have no choice. I will not support the legislation because, as my leader has pointed out, it is a nightmare, it's unworkable, it's not going to achieve the ambitions the government has set for it. I will await as the coming days and weeks present even more unbelievable presentations from this government on these and related matters.

**Mr Harnick:** It's always very interesting to hear the member for Renfrew debate a bill, particularly a bill as important as this bill is. It was particularly interesting tonight, because I thought I would hear where the



Liberal Party was going in terms of the alternatives it was offering to solve a very difficult problem. When we got to the very end of the member's speech he said something to the effect that he supports the fundamental principle of what the government is trying to do but doesn't support this piece of legislation. Unfortunately, at that stage his half-hour ended. I don't know whether he did that deliberately to leave us guessing or whether he had intended to do that and reached the climax, and it was all over, the half-hour had elapsed.

I am no wiser in attempting to debate with my friends in the Liberal Party because I still don't know what they would do in the circumstances. I've heard one of the most respected members and probably the best debater in this House say that in principle he supports what the government is doing, that he recognizes the problem and supports the effort, I believe, to try and solve or make better the problem we have. But then in what appears to be a contradiction, he says, "But I don't support this legislation."

I am more confused now about where the Liberal Party stands and what alternatives it's offering than I was before. Quite frankly, I thought that when the member from Renfrew was finished I would be enlightened. I enjoyed his speech but I am none the wiser as to where this party really stands on this very significant problem.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I must say that I listened attentively to my friend from Renfrew North and I disagree somewhat with the sentiments of my colleague from Willowdale.

I don't believe the last comment of the member from Renfrew North was the climax of his speech; rather, to me, it was the denouement. The climax, I guess, was the philosophy of what the member sees, in a thoughtful way, as the future of politics in this province, if not in Canada and North America. I think he was referring to it as a sort of watershed and the change in the way all parties, whether they be right-wing, centrist or left-wing, will have to deal with questions of economic and fiscal policy in the future.

I do understand, I think, the position taken by the member for Renfrew North with regard to his philosophical support for the principle. That might lead to the member for Willowdale's conclusion that, on second reading, the member for Renfrew North should in fact be supporting the legislation and then, if he believes there are significant changes that should be made, should be prepared to introduce amendments at the committee stage.

But I think the most important part of the speech, and one which is worth marking, is the very fact that the member for Renfrew North believes there are major changes taking place in the restructuring of our economy which will require new economic and political answers for the future, and for that reason I found the

speech quite interesting and thought-provoking.

**2350**

**Mr Elston:** As is normally the case, the member for Renfrew North has touched on several subjects which have not been touched on by other members. But he brings to mind some other points which are interesting and that he did not have time to get into, one of them being section 26 of the act which, he mentioned in passing, is the designation of "critical" jobs in the public and broader public sectors.

It's going to be an interesting test of this particular legislation to describe or delineate the terms which are used in this new bill, because if you look at it, the language is like a strategic plan for an opening or reopening of negotiations, which of course is what it purports to be. But we haven't really got a piece of legislation anywhere that describes "critical." We have terms like "essential services" and other descriptive terms which prescribe the workings of certain of the public sector employees, but never before have we had this word "critical," and it's going to have to be redefined for the people.

The bargains are going to have to be struck between now and August 1 or August 10, depending on which date really is the active one. There are some people in the public sector and broader public sector who will not be represented by any negotiating team whatsoever and will have their terms of contract prescribed by the ministers. That is very unfair, because if you can't convince the minister that you ought to have a negotiating unit developed for you or to represent your interests as a member of a non-bargaining unit group, then you are out of luck and you fall to the "fail-safe" mechanism.

There are provisions in this clause that will become very devastating for people trying to reach an agreement. At the same time, transfers are limited or start to be cut back on July 1.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** One more time and it can border on the repetitious, but certainly it is more than worthy of mention: the eloquence, and the admiration that has been voiced by colleagues from all sides of the House. There are some debates where the member from Renfrew comes as close as possible to rising above partisan lines. This was yet another example, and we're pleased on this side of the House that the philosophy, the intent, the spirit, the compendium of Bill 48 is being recognized by the member.

In fact, quoting him verbatim, he mentioned that perhaps 18 months ago would have been better timing in hindsight. Hindsight is a quality that never leaves the member, for he uses massive, consequential data of what has happened in the past to help him with the present and, hopefully, propel him in the future.

Hence the challenge. He talks about the mechanics

and questions the ability of the government to reconcile within six months with the transfer agencies. I'm talking here in terms of the fiscal year. Yet in our own provincial fiscal year, starting on April 1, we're into it by the better part of three months.

He also questions the ability of the government to reconcile the bottom line: "Will you be able, under the present conditions, to achieve it?" It's a challenge, three months, six months down the line, with the collective efforts of all involved, of all the partners, if it were true, all this, and this is what we're all about: to face and meet the challenge. We don't shoot to kill; we involve people in the collective. It wasn't done in eastern Canada and it wasn't done in western Canada. For the first time since Confederation, people are sitting down, a population of 10.2 million people, and the future, short-term and long-term, will give us reason. But we'll only prove the government of Ontario right if people give it a chance, and that includes both official opposition parties.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Renfrew North has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Conway:** I appreciate the comments of all members. I have a great regard for my friend from Willowdale and I appreciate his criticism. I want to deal very quickly with it, because I didn't plan to take time to address all the issues he pointed to in his criticism.

I would simply say this to my friend from Willowdale: As a Liberal, I would like to think that if we were in government in the very different circumstances of the 1990s, we would have pursued a very different fiscal policy in the period 1991 through 1994 than the current government, which difference I understand. Beyond that, I would say that a Liberal government, if it were to take office in 1995, on my recommendation would be a very different kind of government from the one we saw in the 1980s, simply because the times are so different. I would be recommending to my colleagues a very, very narrow, sharply focused agenda, highlighting two or three areas: certainly education and training, an investment climate and probably one other, in the area of ongoing health care reform.

There's a criticism that I think one could make of Liberals, and I think it's also true of social democrats and the old Progressive Conservatives; if you're a Manning Tory, it's not a problem because you're operating in a much, much more narrow band. But it's the notion that the government can solve everybody's problem, that we've got a program and spending for everything, from the dairy improvement herd to whatever else. I would be saying that in a new government I would be much more interested, because of a very different kind of fiscal environment, that we're going to have to be much more focused. We are going to have to create a business and investment climate that will, hopefully, produce and create more activity, more

employment, more wealth. We're going to have to look, as a provincial responsibility, at significant changes in the areas of education, training and health care, and back away from all kinds of expensive and, in the end, distracting and counterproductive intrusions elsewhere.

**Mr Harnick:** It's always interesting to follow the member for Renfrew North. In the very few moments we have left, to take up on his last comments, I found them very interesting as well as finding his speech interesting. I find it somewhat refreshing that, all of a sudden, everyone in this House believes that the government is too big, does too many things, tries to be too much for all concerned.

The member from Ottawa is shaking her head. I know she would like to do everything for everyone and still believes she can promise everything to everyone and deliver. She might think that, but that has not been the record of her government. She treads on very thin ice when she makes those comments.

When I first came to this place and members of my party talked about smaller, less intrusive government, people scoffed. I remember that because that's one of my initial reactions of coming here. Now I see those who scoffed the loudest talking in the loudest and most strident terms of the need to downsize, of the need to watch spending, of the need to scale down. I remember when I came here that people laughed when you said: "Boy, we spend too much money. We don't have the money that we're spending. You can't tax people any more." All of those were principles that everyone laughed at because everybody thought we were dealing with a bottomless pit, a pit full of money, that you could just do whatever you wanted to do. We found out, obviously the hard way, that you can't operate that way.

I find it very refreshing when the member for Renfrew North—and I wish he had more time to expound on it—believes that the focus of government has to be much more narrow. I tend to agree with him. I think that is the way one has to view this particular piece of legislation. I think the way we got to it and the fact that it's as drastic as it is—and there's a lot about this legislation that I find particularly very dangerous, but the fact is that we had to come to this. I think this piece of legislation probably is beyond the needs—

Mr Speaker, I see you're motioning to me. I look at the clock and I see that it's almost 12 of the clock, so I would move that we adjourn the debate.

**The Speaker:** I don't like to interrupt wisdom, of course. The honourable government House leader.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Just very briefly, flowing out of my statement of last Thursday night on business of this week, which was for today and to be announced thereafter, I'd like to comment on tomorrow's business.



Tomorrow, we will be resuming the adjourned debate on second reading of Bills 48—which we've been debating this evening—79, 32 and 34, resuming the adjourned debate on third reading of Bill 102 and commencing to conduct second reading debates on Bills 25 and 29 and third reading debates on Bills 61 and

169, as well as hoping to move to conducting debate on government notices of motion numbers 5 and 7.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** It being 12 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 2400.

## CONTENTS

Monday 21 June 1993

### SECOND READINGS

#### **Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48**

Mr Sorbara . . . . .	1691, 1696, 1720, 1726
Mr Stockwell . . . . .	1695, 1726
Mrs Haslam . . . . .	1695
Mr Elston . . . . .	1695, 1727, 1736
Mr Arnott . . . . .	1696, 1743
Mr Runciman . . . . .	1696, 1703
Mr Cousens . . . . .	1701, 1705, 1710
Mr Bradley . . . . .	1702, 1717, 1721, 1727
Mrs Mathysen . . . . .	1703
Mr Carr . . . . .	1704, 1717, 1719, 1732
Mr Hope . . . . .	1705, 1720
Mr Mahoney . . . . .	1705, 1711, 1716, 1732
Mr Curling . . . . .	1706, 1712
Mr Pouliot . . . . .	1711
Mr Murphy . . . . .	1711, 1743
Mr David Johnson . . . . .	1712, 1717
Mr Turnbull . . . . .	1716
Ms Harrington . . . . .	1718, 1721
Mr Offer . . . . .	1719, 1732, 1737
Mrs Marland . . . . .	1726, 1727, 1733, 1737
Ms Gigantes . . . . .	1731
Mr Huget . . . . .	1733, 1738
Mr O'Connor . . . . .	1737
Mr Conway . . . . .	1738, 1744
Mr Harnick . . . . .	1742, 1744
Mr Wildman . . . . .	1743

#### **Business of the House**

Mr Charlton . . . . .	1744
-----------------------	------



No. 36A



N° 36A

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 22 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 22 juin 1993



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Tuesday 22 June 1993

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### TOBACCO TAXES

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** Taxes on cigarettes have created a serious smuggling problem in border areas like Cornwall. In the last couple of weeks, emotions have been running high as a result of reports that smuggling of cigarettes is a billion-dollar industry in Canada. Federal and provincial governments are expecting the figure to double in 1993.

Residents in my riding are all too aware that guns, intimidation, bribery and violence are part of the dangers of smuggling cigarettes. St. Lawrence River smugglers have admitted to owning machine guns to protect their goods against law enforcement seizures. Boats without navigational lights and travelling up to 145 kilometres an hour have become a nightly occurrence. Area residents live in fear for themselves, their children and their property. Even Ontario's Solicitor General has admitted the "great potential for danger."

While the Solicitor General of Canada has added additional operational resources to strengthen law enforcement efforts, the RCMP's anti-smuggling unit in Cornwall has said that there are simply not enough police officers to combat the problem.

I implore this government to take swift action and respond to this escalating problem before injuries are sustained.

##### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** Last week the member for Kitchener called on the Minister of Transportation to take immediate action to ensure that median barriers are installed on the Conestoga Parkway in Kitchener-Waterloo. He made this request in response to a fatal accident which took three lives last Tuesday. This latest accident should make it obvious to the minister that urgent action is required to ensure the safety of motorists on this 26-year-old expressway.

Since May 1990 there have been five fatal accidents which have claimed the lives of seven people. These deaths could have been prevented if median barriers had been installed. In fact, a coroner's inquest into the death of Laurie Brain in April 1991 recommended that barriers be installed immediately. Two years after those recommendations were made, the ministry has still not taken action and indicates that they will not install barriers until 1996.

How many more people will have to die before the Minister of Transportation acts? One ministry official indicated last week that an average of 35 people a year

were dying in crossover accidents on Highway 401 between Woodstock and London before barriers were installed there. What unbelievable rationalization. It is unacceptable that money was found to install sound barriers, while no money can be found for safety measures such as median barriers.

I urge the minister to stop the carnage by acting immediately to have median barriers installed on the Conestoga Parkway. Safety should be his first concern.

##### CÉSAR CHAVEZ

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** Cesar Chavez, the United Farm Workers' labour leader, died in April of this year. César Chavez has been described by the president of the California State Senate as "probably the greatest Californian of the 20th century." I would like to remind members that a memorial for César Chavez will be taking place tomorrow evening at Trinity-St Paul's United Church on Bloor Street.

In furthering the empowerment of his people, we associate him with tactics such as strikes and the grape and lettuce boycotts that many of us participated in here. The marches, the fasts, the cries of "Viva la huelga" remain tied in people's perception to La Causa, a labour and civil rights movement with religious overtones linked particularly with the Catholic church.

"The spiritual boldness of César Chavez's leadership gripped the people of his nation like no farm worker ever had done," said Cardinal Mahoney of Los Angeles at his funeral. "For the first time in this century, most Americans became aware of the dreadful plight of the men and women who labour so tirelessly to put food on our table."

I am sure there are many in this House who will want to pay their respects tomorrow evening to this remarkable leader who devoted his life to giving dignity and hope not only to the farm workers but to every one of the Chicano people, who saw for themselves what one brave man, indifferent to his own health and welfare, could accomplish.

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** This summer's weather is as unpredictable as the Conservative position on the social contract legislation. For the past week I've been unable to get an answer from the Conservative caucus regarding its position on Bill 48. The Conservatives are trying to have it both ways. Mike Harris and the Tories have both supported and opposed the social contract process.

First they said that \$2 billion in cuts wasn't enough. Then they accused the NDP of going too far to get the \$2 billion. They have bashed the unions and then criticized the government for union-bashing. They've

demanding legislation to enforce the social contract and then announced that legislation isn't necessary at all. They have proposed simplistic alternatives, then changed their very own numbers to show that their alternatives don't work.

1340

Now they sound like they don't like the social contract bill at all, but they can't tell us yet how they're going to vote. Some Tories say the legislation is just not good legislation but they still might support it; other Tories say that Bill 48 is a seriously flawed piece of legislation but still they might support it. The Conservatives say that a complex and confusing Bill 48 has been created in which the government offers public sector and the public sector workers the worst of all possible options, and yet they still say they might support it.

What's really confusing is the Conservative position on Bill 48. I say stop talking out of both sides of your mouths. You can't have it both ways. I ask you to join my colleagues and join the Liberal caucus and vote against Bill 48. Let's defeat this bad legislation.

#### VEHICLE LICENSING OFFICES

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** The government is systematically trying to bankrupt the province's 1,500 licensing issuers, who operate at a cost of only 3% of revenue. Whenever I have pressed the Minister of Transportation about the government's future intentions, he stressed that the system works well and that there was no intention to change. Three recent occurrences contradict the minister's statement.

First of all, in January 1993 the minister unveiled the self-service kiosk pilot project. These self-service machines have the potential to take away about 50% of the drivers' licensing business from the issuers. Second, the MTO's decision to move to a five-year renewal cycle for driver's licence renewal from a three-year cycle means a 40% reduction in income for the issuers and a loss of revenue for the next government. Third, a move towards multi-year vehicle licensing renewals is nothing more than a tax grab for this government and threatens the continuing existence of this organization by cutting out about 55% of their total transactions.

Does the minister understand these serious threats to the continued existence of the issuers?

#### POLITICAL MAILING

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** Here we go again—some more junk mail from the Leader of the Opposition.

A Guelph resident received this letter from the Leader of the Opposition. She promises to go to bat for the residents of Guelph, saying that the government wants to downsize and delay the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food move, and she says that Bob Rae and Derek Fletcher are not really showing regard for their local economies.

Well, I've got news for the leader. The OMAF project is going to Guelph and it's going to create jobs and it's going to have economic spinoff, and because we took the time to re-examine the Guelph relocation and made a few changes to it, we're saving the taxpayers about \$9 million. We can do it because we can afford it this time, just because we're going to eliminate a conference hall and some fitness facilities that already exist within the community. That's how we save money in Ontario.

The Liberals save money by sending out campaign literature, setting up a 1-800 line. No ideas. The leader was so eager to jump at this that she couldn't wait to start licking the stamps. But she's wrong, and the letter doesn't get the facts straight.

Then she says she's going to cancel Jobs Ontario. Well, let me tell you, you tell the hundreds of people in my community who are off UIC and who are off social assistance because of Jobs Ontario and then you can come back and say something.

This constituent also phoned the 1-800 line, and he doesn't have an answer yet. In fact he's had several people say, "I'll get back to you."

Why doesn't the Leader of the Opposition lead by example? Why not stop sending out this junk mail and setting up 1-800 lines? Why not stop her four-year election campaign, and especially stop wasting taxpayers' money?

#### ALZHEIMER RESPITE COMPANION PROGRAM

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** On Friday of last week I met with the respite workers and family care givers who are involved with Alzheimer patients. The care givers are the people, of course, who serve with the people. They're right in the home looking after those with Alzheimer. The Alzheimer respite workers are on contract to the regional Alzheimer respite companion program, and they provide an excellent service to people in our part of the province.

They convened a meeting to update local members on the plight of clients with Alzheimer disease and other dementia. These clients have need for specialized care, as outlined in the Guidelines for Care published by the Alzheimer Society of Canada in September 1992.

What these people are looking for is adequate government funding for their program, and I call upon the government of Ontario, for the sake of the care givers who must spend almost half their time with Alzheimer patients, whose own health is impacted both physically and psychologically by their obligation to care for often difficult patients who are family members, to abandon the hundreds of thousands of dollars it is spending on polls to tell it what it thinks and on self-congratulatory government advertising and allocate the mere \$25,000 needed to maintain this essential Alzheimer respite companion program.



## TRANSFER PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** My statement is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It concerns the financial impact his government's social contract will have on many municipalities in Simcoe county.

Your government will slash a total of \$275 million in transfer payments to Ontario's municipal sector, and that will result in a cut of \$361,000 to Simcoe county; \$671,000 to the city of Orillia; a \$107,000 cut to the town of Penetang; \$17,000 to the village of Coldwater; \$10,000 to Elmvale; \$26,000 to Flos township; \$35,000 to Medonte township; \$59,000 to Orillia; Oro township will be cut by \$70,000; \$87,000 to Tiny township; \$63,000 to Mara and \$12,000 to Rama township.

Minister, in your letter of June 14 to municipalities to announce the transfer payment cuts, you indicate, "Everyone, the government, employers and bargaining agents, is committed to ensuring that the impact of the fiscal reduction is distributed fairly." Many municipalities have already slashed their budgets and cut days of work.

Clearly, employers, workers, bargaining agents, municipalities and the Ontario PC caucus have taken up the cause of debt reduction and spending controls. The only group not committed is the NDP government of Ontario, which has created chaos long after municipalities have brought down their budgets and already made fiscal commitments.

Minister, why don't you freeze hiring, freeze wages and reduce your waste such as full-page ads, welfare reform and health card fraud? Why don't you clean up the mess? It'll save you \$4 billion.

## DEAF-BLIND AWARENESS WEEK

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** This week, June 21 to June 27, is Deaf-Blind Awareness Week in Canada and I'm happy once again to ask all the members of the House to join me in recognizing these very deserving people. I would especially like to acknowledge the efforts of many people and organizations that have worked so hard towards meeting the needs of the deaf-blind community on such issues as accessibility, education, employment, housing and transportation.

One of the bigger events planned for this week is a barbecue being sponsored by the Deaf-Blind Association of Toronto, along with other local groups. This is an excellent opportunity for members of the deaf-blind community to get together, to meet new friends and old friends and share some stories and experiences.

In the members' gallery today are a number of exceptional people who are here to participate in recognizing this week with us. I welcome Sean Brogan and Laurel Kelliher, who are residents of the Independent Living Residence for the Deaf-Blind in Ontario, and their intervenors, Amy Walker and Linda Stuckey, as well as Connie Southall, the executive director of the

Independent Living Residence for the Deaf-Blind in Ontario. Also, the president of the Canadian Deaf-Blind and Rubella Association joins them. I welcome you all and wish you the best of luck for your promotion of deaf-blind issues.

## CORRECTION

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I beg your indulgence. Yesterday in my member's statement I inadvertently referred to an editorial and I attributed my comments to the Port Perry Star. In fact, it was the Scugog Citizen. I'd like that to go on the record.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** That is not a point of order; it's a correction.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, I wonder if I might have unanimous consent to make a statement about the passing of a member of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

1350

## BUD GERMA

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Yesterday, the Deputy Premier and I were away from the House attending the funeral of Bud Germa, who was a member of this place from 1971 to 1981. I'd like to take this opportunity to say a few words about him.

Bud Germa was born in the Sudbury basin. He joined the armed forces, the RCAF, in the Second World War. He came back to Sudbury and worked as an electrician for Inco. He then went into municipal politics. He was elected to the federal Parliament in a by-election in 1967 and he was elected to the provincial Legislature in 1971. He was defeated in the election of 1981.

Bud passed away over the weekend after a long struggle with cancer. I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about him beyond the simple description of the chronology of his political career.

I did not in fact serve with him, though I was the leader of the party from 1982. Of course, I got to know him extremely well because he remained politically active until the very end of his life. Those who served with him—and I know there are some members present who remember him vividly from his time in the House. He was what I think one could describe as a political original. He was someone of great passion, verve, good humour and blunt speech.

He was not someone who either minced his words or chose to phrase them in particularly flowery ways. His eloquence stemmed entirely from his experience and from his sense of the people he represented. He cared deeply about the people of Sudbury and the Sudbury basin. He cared deeply about the people he worked with and for. He cared passionately about their health and their safety and their position in our society. He cared very, very deeply about this province and about Canada.

I said that Bud Germa was a man of great and good humour. It is not, I think, possible for me to express in quite as pungent and direct a way Bud's humour, certainly in the current political climate, but I would say that Bud's commitment to being straightforward and his commitment to service was not a grim or onerous task for him; it was one that he took up with gusto and with a great deal of vigour and with a great deal of joy.

He was a tremendous partisan debater in this House at a time when night sittings were a regular fact of life rather than a two-week exception at the end of a session. He was known to everyone as a tremendous participant in debates, particularly in the periods of the minority governments between 1975 and 1981, when debates and votes were constant and were very closely argued.

I know that other members will want to say a few words. I had a chance yesterday, together with the Minister of Finance, to raise a glass at the Nickel City Hotel at about the time question period was due to start yesterday as we were reflecting at the end of the funeral on his commitment to ordinary people, on his sense of passion and compassion for them and on the enormous joy that he took in public service.

All of us will miss him. I shall certainly miss him. To his family, many of whom we were able to meet yesterday—to all of them—we wish our very best and our sense that this is, of course, a sad event, but it's also a moment in which we celebrate a remarkable life of service for the people of the province.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I rise on behalf of the Liberal caucus to express, as well, to the family and close friends of Bud Germa our remorse and our sadness at his passing last weekend.

It was just last week that I was chatting with some of the Sudbury members about Bud Germa, asking about his health, because I know that, particularly in recent weeks, he has had great difficulty in his battle with cancer.

It's interesting that, when I say "a battle with cancer," Bud Germa was never a person who would give up. I was reading an article from the Sudbury Star on February 23 of this year. One of the comments that Bud made himself with his usual candour was the following: "The prognosis is not terminal at this point. It's going to have to get me, because I'm not going to give up." That probably exemplifies Bud Germa and what he was all about.

Bud Germa, to me, was always what I expected in a New Democrat. He was perhaps a stereotypical New Democrat from northern Ontario, where I was born a number of years ago in the city of Sudbury, and the causes he fought for were causes that were dear to the people in that area, particularly to workers who worked in difficult circumstances relating to health and safety in

the area. He was a very grass-roots individual. He had little time for theory and academia. In fact, he once referred to members of his own party who were more the people relying on theory—and I can't remember the first part, but academic something heads, and I can't remember what it was. But that was terminology he used on that particular occasion.

Bud Germa, as I say, was a fighter. He was a person who represented his constituents well at the municipal level, in the federal Parliament where he served for almost two years after winning a by-election and of course in the Ontario Legislature, and even after he left the Ontario Legislature he was still a force to be reckoned with in his community.

Always the people who are closest to people like Bud Germa have probably the most relevant things to say about them. One I was reading was by Ron MacDonald, who is a staff representative with the United Steelworkers of America. He had a couple of things to say about him which I think really point out what Bud Germa was all about.

He said, "Germa stood out from most politicians because what you saw is what you got," and how true that was. He also said: "When he believed in something he fought for it. You didn't have to agree with his position, but you knew he didn't have a hidden agenda. He wasn't slick or polished and there was nothing devious about him."

That, I guess, says it best, perhaps better than anyone of us could, and I thought it was most appropriate that subsequent to the funeral, the report I had was that many of his friends proceeded to an establishment in Sudbury which was well known to many people in the area. I was too young, of course, to ever be involved with it, but I know that many people in the Sudbury area have heard of the Nickel City Hotel. Bud would have been delighted that, subsequent to celebrating his life and paying tribute to him as he passed, the congregation then moved to the Nickel City for the wake.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Bud Germa came to this Legislature in 1971. I came here in 1977 and had the experience of sitting on the opposite side of the House in government while Bud Germa sat in these benches in opposition. I can remember sort of the first blush of Bud Germa. We used to sit late at night and I used to time my exit out of here so I wasn't going home on the same street as Bud Germa was, because I thought if there's one guy I don't want to meet on a dark Toronto street it's Bud Germa.

But I must say that over the ensuing three or four years I got to know Bud Germa a little bit better, and as the previous speakers have said, Bud did appear like a very tough guy on the outside and was very direct. Conversations with him on political structure and theories would be less than a sentence long and he would be very pointed.



Because he was pointed he did appear rough on the exterior, but when you got sitting down with him, I don't think anybody on any side of the bench or any political party could doubt his integrity and his real softness on the inner. He was really a Softee Toffee and probably wouldn't like you saying that, but the truth of the matter is that he was very generous in terms of his time, given particularly I believe to people who really needed it in his area, and people who really needed his help and came to him. He was probably the least selective of anybody in terms of who he dealt with and how he dealt with the problem.

1400

I know his good friends like the member for Nickel Belt, Mr Laughren, and Mr Martel, who spent many hours with him, both in this place and in other establishments, enjoyed the number of stories that Bud Germa had. Bud Germa had more stories about various aspects of Ontario life than anybody I know of.

He probably epitomized sort of the two extremes of politics. On the one hand, if you got him into an argument in this place about an issue, you couldn't get somebody who was more dogged, more determined, more stubborn about that, but on the other hand, you probably couldn't find a person in the Legislature at the time who was more good natured and better humoured than Bud Germa.

I think that when people who watch us on television from time to time see us laugh at an inappropriate time, the odd time that happens to us, because politics is a tough thing to live with when people are talking about passionate issues on one hand and then an off comment comes and we laugh at the inappropriate times, I think in some ways he represented that kind of dichotomy that we find in politics here in the province of Ontario.

I think Bud Germa did, as he would say, a hell of a job for his constituents in Sudbury. He was a guy who worked with his hands, who came to this Legislature and continued to represent the people who did work with their hands.

I want to express our sympathies and our appreciation, as members of the Progressive Conservative Party, for the contribution he made to this Legislature, to Sudbury and to the people of Ontario when he served them so well in this place. Our sympathies go to his family and his friends. We will all miss Bud Germa for his contribution and his good humour and his good nature that he brought so well to this place.

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I'd ask for unanimous consent to say a few words about the passing away of Smirle Forsyth.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Do we have unanimous agreement? Agreed.

SMIRLE FORSYTH

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):**

On Sunday, a number of us became aware of the passing away of a very good friend and certainly a servant of this Legislature. Smirle Forsyth served the people of Ontario as Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees for close to 15 years.

During that time, we saw some tremendously good changes and improvements that he participated in: the televising of our debates, the opening of the committee system, the improvement in translation services, the improvement in library research services to committees and so many things that Smirle felt were necessary for Parliament, which he loved so much and that he had such a knowledge of.

The courage and the stoic way in which he approached his battle with cancer over the last many months I think, to many of us who knew him, was quite typical of the way in which he lived his life. Smirle never wanted to be a bother or trouble to anyone. When I telephoned him on a few occasions, there was none of the bitterness that one might have at a situation that was painful and incapacitated him in many ways but, rather, simply an interest in finding out what was going on and in assuring us that he was fine in his apartment, even to the point of being quite humorous and joking about different things that were happening.

He lived his last days in the way in which he lived his life in this Legislature: as someone who was independent, as someone who was self-sufficient, as someone who wanted to be of service to everyone but of trouble to no one.

For many years, he served as the clerk of the justice committee that I chaired and we had some very eventful and interesting things that happened before that justice committee. I can remember the rather difficult and complicated hearings into Re-Mor and Astra Trust and the very interesting and very extensive hearings as we improved the law reform and family reform legislation.

Smirle always provided the very best possible advice in a quiet and professional but fairly firm manner. Nothing could ever flap him. I can recall when some 300 people showed up at a committee hearing wanting to speak and wanting to get access to the little committee room. Smirle was very firm but very courteous and informed them that he would arrange for a much larger room. We moved over to the Mowat Block and we were able to conduct our hearings in a way that was befitting of a Parliament, as Smirle would say, and that had the kind of dignity that he believed debate should take place in that way.

Smirle was always perfectly groomed. Even on the warmest day his tie was in place and his hair was in place, and his jacket was on and he was the epitome of the well-tailored man. Bud Wildman my colleague, the Minister of Environment and Energy, tells me of walking into a drinking establishment in Washington and seeing that it was a western music establishment

and everyone was in jeans and cowboy hats and cowboy boots and open shirts, and there was Smirle, not a hair out of place, with his tie in place, a perfect suit, but enjoying himself tremendously in talking with the people who were in that bar. He could talk to everyone and yet make them feel comfortable, even though in some ways he was perhaps more reserved and perhaps a little bit quieter than most of us.

One of the qualities I most admired about Smirle was that he would always tell you what he knew you should hear, not what he thought you wanted to hear. This honesty and integrity, I think, was very helpful to committee Chairs who may have at times been tempted to want to get different advice.

Smirle was a person whose personality grew on you. First of all, you were impressed by his competence, then later by his integrity and his love for Parliament, and gradually as you got to know him and could have some quiet conversations with him, by the fact that he really did like people, he was interested in people, he cared about people and he was anxious in helping members of all parties in any way possible and in a completely non-partisan way.

The Premier this morning shared with me his sadness at the loss that we've all received in Smirle's passing away on Sunday, and I know that he'll be personally writing to the family. The Legislature and the people of Ontario have lost a hardworking, dedicated servant, and those of us who knew him so well have lost a friend.

**Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence):** I too would like to join in passing along our sympathies and condolences to Smirle Forsyth's family and friends on behalf of the Liberal caucus. I would like to pass that on to the family and friends of Smirle Forsyth.

I just want to say about Smirle that I think he represented the finest traditions of this House. He was a true scholar of this assembly. A lawyer by profession, he had a profound and great understanding of the workings of Parliament. He added great value to this assembly's work. At all times he was a consummate professional and he brought a great deal of dignity and honour to this assembly.

I got to know Smirle on a number of occasions when we travelled on committee, a luxury we can no longer afford, but during those days we got to know each other quite well. Smirle was very insightful and in my early years starting off as a member of Parliament, I really appreciated Smirle's forthrightness and his ability to pass along useful information about the workings of the assembly and the workings of committees, which is most important to a member who's just starting off.

1410

Smirle's real legacy as far as I'm concerned is that in getting to know members, and I think this could be said of almost all members who came to know Smirle, he

was a real comrade, if you will, of all members of this assembly. You got to know him in that spirit, particularly, as I say, when we travelled. I think his great contribution to members like myself who were starting off was that he elevated the status of members by making them really feel that they were involved in a worthwhile process, particularly for backbenchers. I think that was so important.

Back then, when I was a backbencher—well, I'm still a backbencher, but I would say that especially early on, when this place seemed rather a different place to do business in and I wasn't quite familiar with the workings of the assembly, he certainly passed along that sense of great respect for this assembly, its work and the great dignity of this place. At all times, he expressed that in his actions and in his advice to members. Obviously, we remember him for those wonderful attributes.

Smirle, as has been stated before, never imposed himself on anyone. He certainly was very independent to the end. He held out on his own with a great deal of respect for this assembly and its workings and at all times symbolized that sense of loyalty and the real faith he had in the workings of this assembly and its importance.

I would like to say that we will miss him sorely. All of us mourn his loss and we pass on our sympathies to his family.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** Our party would like to join in as well in the very fine remarks from the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale and the member for Lawrence.

It's one of those times when several members from our caucus wanted to be able to participate in just saying some words of Smirle today. In fact, it was rather significant in my view when on October 6 last year, 10 members of this House took turns to comment on the very great dedication that this one person has given to the Legislative Assembly. In reading through those remarks now, one can really sense that he left us a legacy.

Often you think, "If these walls could talk." I'm glad they can't. For some of the things that go on around here, every one of us would have a conscience that would twinge. Smirle wouldn't, because there wasn't a moment when he was here and on duty or not on duty that he wasn't serving in the spirit of the great parliamentary tradition that we are a part of. His 14 years here were just part of the giving of one person's life to the work of democracy, to the work of the betterment of Ontario and the betterment of this system.

I had the pleasure of working with Smirle and the table clerks when I was Deputy Speaker. There's only one still left at the table. Alex McFedries is still there, but it's great to see him continuing in something of that



tradition. Before that there were David Callfas and Rod Lewis, but then there very much was Smirle. The way in which people continue to carry forward that sense of responsibility—people have no idea of the amount of work that goes on behind the scenes that makes this place tick, that keeps it going. That was certainly part of the experience that our own House leader, Ernie Eves, had when he was first on committee and he was working with our friend Smirle at the time and old Duke McTavish.

There are stories that go back a long way. It has to do with people who are as conscientious and as caring and as dedicated as these people have been in the tradition of this House.

One of the things that stands out is that not just here in this province and in this House have we appreciated Smirle's efforts, but as you travelled across the country or met with clerks in other jurisdictions, they would always say, "How is Smirle?" There's an ongoing sense of caring about him, for one who cared so much about others as well.

As we remember him today, I think there's something that we also remember, and that is that cancer is still very much a problem. May we in this day and age continue to look at those people like Terry Fox, like Smirle, like so many others who have fought that battle and lost. May we who are left continue to fight the battle for them that we can find some remedy to this heinous disease and that there won't be the casualties to that battle against cancer that we have seen with, again, Smirle's passing now.

We will today remember Smirle, and I suggest that those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him and knew him and loved him for what he was and who he was will also remember him in the future. As we take our sincere sympathies to his family, as we come along and make another contribution to fight cancer, as we come into the House, we will again remember that there was someone here working to serve in the way that Smirle did. Maybe we in our own capacity can rise to the level of excellence that he so wonderfully gave.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I know our party has had an opportunity to speak about Smirle, but I couldn't help but rise and indicate something to all of you, that Smirle, after you signed this card for him, sent me a note wanting me to thank all of you on behalf of doing that. It was a lot of fun for him trying to decipher a lot of the names and it brought back a lot of memories.

Smirle has been addressed today as a person who was very serious. I also saw some humour in some of the things and some of the events that perhaps—maybe I saw it more because I had more dealings with him sitting in chairmen's jobs and perhaps on the road.

Finally, Smirle, we will miss you greatly. In fact Smirle was a fellow who not only helped us in our work as chairmen but also he made certain we got to our destination and that all our luggage got there as well. Without Smirle I'm sure that in going to Windsor, many of us would have wound up in Sudbury.

I want to thank you, Smirle, wherever you are. God bless you.

**Mr Jean Poirier (Prescott and Russell):** Having served this assembly as Deputy Speaker for three years between 1987 and 1990, I also want to join with what my friends and colleagues have said about Smirle. As Deputy Speaker, I was very fortunate to have, with all the other clerks and clerk assistants, Smirle at the table.

It's always interesting when this House rises to interesting moments and when you're all alone there with one of the clerk assistants. If that person happened to be Smirle, you could—those of you who were there at the time would remember Smirle sitting there very stoic and very confident like the Rock of Gibraltar or, like consulting the Encyclopaedia Britannica, you know he had the answer but he would just sit there.

I would lean forward and say, "Smirle." Then he would turn very slowly, and once he would turn, you knew you would get the very sound advice. For that I want to thank him; very much integrity, very much knowledgeable, very friendly and with a very great sense of humour. We all know his dedication to his job. He would provide you with the answer that, as we heard before, you needed to know. But he would add, "But then there's also," and he would give you a range of answers that you could pick from.

His advice was always very good and very solid. As we all know, Smirle also had the dignity and the quiet way in which he could pop a sweet at any moment because he had very much of a sweet tooth. I want to offer his family our condolences and I would want Smirle to fax me confirmation, from where he is, there are lots of candies for him for a long time to come.

Smirle, we're going to miss you quite a bit.

**Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East):** Permit me just to say a few words about my personal friend Smirle. When I was first elected in 1985 and the House first convened, I received a note from Bob Nixon telling me that I was appointed Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole House. I didn't know what it meant. I sincerely didn't know what it meant. I approached him afterwards and he said, "Perhaps you should speak to the Clerk," the then clerk, Mr Lewis.

I quickly learned what was the role, and Smirle was assigned to me to work with me every week, every Wednesday, from 9 to 10 o'clock to learn the procedures, to learn the traditions, to learn the protocol. I remember so vividly when I sat where you are now, Mr Speaker, and I thought that all eyes were on me. Of

course, everybody was ignoring me; I know that now.

It was just like being given the wheel of a ship. Smirle was there, you know: "Steady as it goes," "Make sure that you don't say this or you don't say that," or "If somebody's too noisy, get up, tell him to keep quiet," which I did. Smirle was always there to give me comfort, to give me support. Your job is lonely, I know that, and you need that support. You need that understanding. Smirle was always able to do that.

I spoke to him about a month ago too. He was then blind. I said to him, "Do you turn the radio on sometimes?" and he said, "I turn on the television. I don't see anything, but I can recognize the voice. I create my own little scenario," which I thought was great. He loved this House. He really loved it.

He was patient. He was very meticulous. As my colleague Mr Philip said, he was always impeccably dressed, and that reflected so well in his personality. It reflected so well also on all of us, all the members. I will miss him, and what I find so unfair is that he died so young. He was only 42.

1420

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I wonder if, in closing, I might just say that in addition to sending our condolences and expressing them very strongly to Smirle's family, to his parents and brother and sister and nephews and nieces, I think we should also perhaps remember that the table officers have lost a good friend and a colleague as well.

Since the rules of the House do not permit them normally to speak, I just simply want to say to them very personally that we know your loss and we share it with you. Smirle was a great and good friend of all of us who work in this place, and we shall miss him and we know you will as well. Perhaps we can find a way through some work we do together to remember him in a way that will allow his name to be remembered and his presence here to be remembered by all of us.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** First, the kind and thoughtful comments by the Premier, by the member for St Catharines and the member for Carleton will be conveyed to the family of Bud Germa.

Members will know, as the member for York South has indicated, that it is the practice in Parliament that those who are seated at the table do not speak to the House. I know that this is an occasion when each of them would like to break that rule. May I say on their behalf to Mr and Mrs Forsyth that your son served this House with great distinction and he was, in every way to measure, a true friend of Parliament.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier. Premier, you have apparently indicated that you are willing to back away from the

August 1 deadline for imposing the wage rollback provisions of your Bill 48. It would seem that after three months of delay and confusion and paralysis you have understood that the time guidelines that you have imposed are just simply not going to work.

There is still no sign that real negotiations are about to be resumed, and quite clearly the negotiation process cannot take place successfully in the time that is left before that August 1 deadline, so I am quite frankly glad that you have acknowledged that.

I ask whether you will now take the next step and acknowledge that your transfer partners cannot achieve the full extent of the cuts you're demanding in the remaining six months of their budget year.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** As the Leader of the Opposition knows full well, because one of her assistants attends my morning scrums every day and I'm sure she gets briefed on them regularly, she knows full well what I said last night and what I said this morning, and that is that within the framework of the legislation it is, as I said in answer to a question, entirely possible that where sectoral discussions are taking place, those discussions may well reach the targets in ways other than a total freeze as of August 1. They may well find some other way to do that, and that is entirely within the confines and within the framework of the legislation which has been set out.

I would say to the honourable member, our sense from talking to our transfer partners is that there's a great recognition of the fact that negotiations need to happen. There are in fact negotiations that are now well under way taking place, have been for the last few days, will continue for the next few days. We continue to believe those negotiations are going to be very productive in some sectors—could be in all sectors, if people were willing to go.

I guess the question, what I would think we would all want to have answered in the affirmative by all parties, is that we would want to encourage everyone to come to the table and to negotiate successfully the kinds of targets that we've set out.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** The member last week said she shared our target with respect to deficit reduction. She said she shared that goal. Now she seems to be reversing herself entirely, 180 degrees. We've been quite consistent in this regard, quite clear in this regard. We still think the targets can be met and we still think negotiations need to happen, and that's exactly what this party has been saying.

**Mrs McLeod:** Premier, we continue to ask you for some realistic, workable approach to achieve the cuts that you have set out. The question today relates to the reality that it is now almost July. You have asked the



transfer partners to implement a full year of cuts, a full 5% reduction in their compensation costs, in a six-month time frame.

What that means, if they were to achieve those cuts as required by your legislation, is that they would need double the wage rollbacks to get that 5% in the last six months of the year or they would need twice as many layoffs, if that is the approach which they have to take in order to get that 5% reduction. So instead of a 5% reduction over 12 months, what you're actually forcing is something more like a 10% reduction in half a year's time.

Premier, we are agreeing, we continue to agree, that you have to cut payroll costs in the broader public sector. Unlike our friends on the other side of the opposition, we have not said that a wage freeze alone is going to achieve the purposes. In fact we continue to believe, and I don't think it is naïveté, that people are actually still prepared to look for ways to achieve the cuts if you would just give them a process that can be allowed to work.

**The Speaker:** Would the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** But, Premier, they cannot any longer achieve the magnitude of cuts you're looking for, which you yourself would acknowledge is a full year's impact, in what is really six months of the year. I ask you, seriously, if you want your negotiations to succeed, if you want to achieve the cuts that you're looking for in a realistic way, will you not adjust your transfer payments to match the six months that remain in the year?

**Hon Mr Rae:** First of all, in terms of the fiscal year, we're talking about a fiscal year for us which started in April.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** But not for school boards, not for municipalities.

**Hon Mr Rae:** The member shouts back, "Not for school boards and municipalities." We've already indicated, in the course of negotiation and in the course of discussion—I met with AMO; we've had discussions with the school boards where we've indicated very clearly we're prepared to take—

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** They're halfway through their fiscal year.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Exactly, and we're prepared to take that into account in terms of what happens in January and relationship between our fiscal year and theirs. That's all been taken into account.

I would say to the honourable member, if she agrees on deficit reduction and if she agrees that a freeze is not enough, will she now stand in her place and encourage all the partners to come to the table and negotiate effectively what could be done, which is precisely what needs to be done?

**Mrs McLeod:** No, Premier, I will not, because that

has not been our position from day one.

Let me remind you of the alternative that we have been arguing from day one. It is the alternative that your government put in place a realistic budget, that you set the financial targets, that you then sit down with your own employees and negotiate the way to achieve those cuts and you let other employers and employees do the same thing.

I thought that last week you understood that, until you brought in legislation that kept trying to pull too many people back to one central table and impose comprehensive, broad-brush solutions which will not work, and no, I will not advocate that people come to the table to do that.

1430

I will argue that you put in place a process which will work to allow realistic cuts to be achieved. I would strongly support your need to get your budget targets met and to get that deficit under \$10 billion. I will not support your mismanagement and your failure to put a realistic, workable process in place to achieve that goal.

Let me say to you, Premier, that I believe you could ask your transfer partners to make cuts that have a 5% reduction impact over a full year. I believe you could get the rest of the \$2 billion that you need for this budget year to meet your budget target by reviewing your ineffective and questionable programs, and we say that over and over again. Look at Jobs Ontario, look at your housing program, look at the implementation of your advocacy legislation, to name just a few.

**The Speaker:** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes, I will. The Premier says that he has listened to the municipalities, that he keeps taking into account their concerns. The municipalities have asked for exactly what I am proposing to the Premier today. They've asked that you phase in the cuts so that you will achieve your projected savings but over three municipal budget years, not the two and a half of your target which you are now imposing.

I ask if you will listen to what the municipalities and others are asking for: reduce your social contract targets; adjust your transfer payment cuts; find the balance by cutting more out of your own operations.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would only say to the honourable member that the question of the impacts on municipal budgets and of the impact on school board budgets are issues that are being dealt with directly at the table by us. Of course they are.

But I would say in addition, just in response to the honourable member, that it's a classic phoney opposition tactic. They say they support the objective but not one of the means that are being put forward to deal with it in a realistic fashion. You want to have your cake, you want to be able to eat it at the same time, and you

want to have even more cake to eat tomorrow and be able to eat that as well and say, "Look how much we're doing." That kind of approach just won't wash, given the very tough times we're in right now. It just won't wash.

**Mrs McLeod:** Two weeks ago, this Premier stood in this House and said the approach that we have argued for from day one was the one that he believed he was going to have to put in place. Unfortunately, he hasn't figured out how to do that yet.

#### TAX AND FEE INCREASES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** The second question is also to the Premier, this time on another subject, another disaster that this government's mismanagement is bringing about. It relates to the \$2-billion tax grab that we said, at the time you brought in your budget, was going to kill jobs and kill any economic recovery that we would all like to see, and it relates more directly to the \$239 million in fee increases which you are looking for in addition to the \$2-billion tax grab and the fact that your government has refused to acknowledge that those taxes and those fee increases were in fact going to put more people out of work, were going to cost this province jobs.

We are now seeing the impact of those tax increases and those fee increases, and most particularly, those of us from northern Ontario are seeing the impact of a 43% increase in the cost of stumpage. On a daily basis this week, logging and sawmilling operations are being forced to shut down, and today alone I heard of 45 layoffs in this industry.

I understand, and I know you understand, that these aren't the big operators. These are the small business people who employ seven or eight people and keep seven or eight families going, and these are the kinds of jobs that are being lost today.

Now that you see, and surely you're aware of this, the job losses, the closed businesses that are a direct result of this measure, will you withdraw this punitive 43% increase in stumpage fees?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer that to the Minister of Finance.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** It is true that the budget contained a balance of some tax increases and some of what we know as non-tax revenues, and there was an increase in the stumpage fees that the sawmill operators will pay. I'm sure that, coming from northern Ontario, the leader of the official opposition knows that the sawmill operators in the province have had a very decent year as compared to the pulp and paper operators.

I'm very much aware that the Liberal Party is opposed to any tax increases whatsoever; they're opposed to any non-tax revenues; they're opposed to the deficit being as big as it is, but they're opposed to any

expenditure reductions. The Liberal Party of this province is opposed to everything.

**Mrs McLeod:** I say to the Minister of Finance, you can only get your taxes, you can only get your increased fees, if people are able to stay in business. That's a basic bottom line. You aren't going to get these fee increases, because people can't stay in business.

The Finance minister, in answering my question, seems to refer to this myth of windfall profits that's out there somewhere. Let me tell you about the kind of people who are going out of business today because of your fee increase. One example: Wally Ranta, who happens to have a small logging operation in northern Ontario, employs seven to eight people. He makes about \$7 profit on a cord of wood, at least he used to.

In the last two months, his stumpage fees have increased twice, once for the quarterly adjustment brought in by the ministry and the second time for the fee increase that you put into your budget. He is now going to be asked to pay—and remember, he makes \$7 profit on a cord of wood—the government something in the order of \$16 to \$20 a cord in stumpage fees, which is twice as much as what he was paying two months ago. That leaves him in a net loss position, and he cannot afford to pay your government for the privilege of staying in business. Mr Ranta will not be continuing to log. He has announced that he will be closing down on July 1 and he will be laying off his eight employees.

How do you expect small business people like Mr Ranta to survive and keep employing people when your tax measures and your fee increases make it absolutely impossible for him to make any profit at all; in fact, to experience a loss if he tries to keep going?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I don't expect anyone to like tax increases, but at the same time I think that fair-minded people will appreciate the fact that we are governing in very difficult times and we had to have a combination of reductions on expenditures all across government, that we had to have some tax increases in order to help us control the deficit, and the third component of our package was to reduce expenditures on the public compensation side.

In every single case, the leader of the official opposition stands in her place here, day after day, and says, "We don't want any tax increases, we don't want you to control expenditures in the public sector and we don't want you to reduce expenditures overall across the province," and, of course, "We want a deficit that's below \$10 billion." I really wish the leader of the official opposition would get out of her time warp, get into the real world and start proposing alternatives in this place.

**Mrs McLeod:** What do I have to do to get a basic bottom line across to the Treasurer of this province? If he doesn't want to talk jobs, okay; if he doesn't want to



talk people, okay. But at least talk economics. You can't get your fee increases if they're going out of business, and they are all going out of business.

*Interjections.*

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes, they are. I have a letter from a somewhat larger operator, a letter that was sent to the Minister of Natural Resources from John Wilson, who's president of Liskeard Lumber in New Liskeard, Ontario. Mr Wilson writes, "It's difficult to convey in writing the confusion, the disillusion and state of shock that is echoing across this struggling industry," and that is what we are hearing every day from every community across northern Ontario where there is a logging or sawmilling operation.

In sheer frustration with what you have done and in their frustration at not being able to get you to pay any attention to the impact that your fee increases are having on their ability to stay in business, I'm sure you know that they are considering taking drastic action, including blockading highways. I understand that the Minister of Natural Resources is going to meet with the lumber manufacturers next week. They want a commitment, they want an assurance that you understand their concerns and that you are prepared to remove this tax. I am calling on you today to make that same commitment. Will you deal with their concerns? Will you withdraw this fee increase?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I appreciate the acknowledgement from the leader of the official opposition that the Minister of Natural Resources will be meeting with the operators, I believe it is next week, and that he will be, I'm sure, having a conversation with me as a result of that meeting. But I don't think it serves anybody well for the leader of the official opposition to cry from her position of some stature in this Legislature that everybody is going out of business. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I wish the official opposition would stop spreading that kind of misinformation.

1440

SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier on the social contract. I noticed this morning that you seemed to be listening to my caucus and considering, as one of the options, using anniversary dates of contracts as a starting point for a three-year wage reduction program. I want to indicate that our caucus feels strongly that this should be one of the options, because we see that as leading to permanent long-term downsizing at the end of three years, as opposed to some of the short-term solutions that are there.

Premier, you will know as well that this was one of the six specifics we had indicated that we had hoped to see in your legislation. One of the other proposals of those six that I'd like to talk to you about today deals

with the establishment of an expenditure review committee. This committee would look for waste and inefficiency in government. We will be moving an amendment to Bill 48, as that bill moves through the legislative process, to establish this committee. I would ask the Premier if he would support that amendment to establish a formal Ontario expenditure review committee to see what other savings we can find as well.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Let me just say to the honourable member that in terms of the preface to the question, what was indicated by me last night as far as I'm aware, has always been available to the parties and has always been one of the options that has been discussed. That's absolutely clear. I just wanted to say that for the record. I would say in answer to the question that again that's something we have discussed and that has been on the table with respect to our discussions with our partners in the broader public service, both employers and employees. Of course I'd have to see the wording of any such amendment and exactly what its purview would be, but I have no objection to our having committees which have the responsibility of looking at expenditure review, none at all.

**Mr Harris:** Perhaps we do need further discussion. If we can make the review committee as non-partisan and as broadly representative as possible, I think we can achieve some very positive results over and above and beyond just social contract talks.

Yesterday, Premier, and you may disagree with a couple of these, I thought the member for St Catharines quite appropriately condemned the waste by your office in full-page ads in 21 daily newspapers. Today, the Toronto Sun reported that tax money was being used to fund humour-related creative writing courses for the Canadian Auto Workers. We checked with the community arts development office of the Ontario Arts Council, and it confirmed what I think is a misuse of tax dollars. We raised this very issue with you a year ago on grants for very similar purposes which we felt were a very one-sided abuse, if you like, of taxpayers' dollars. Premier, it may not seem like much to you, \$30,000 on a \$10-billion deficit, but I would ask you this: When we're looking at cutting out waste, how can you possibly continue to condone this particular \$30,000 abuse of tax dollars?

**Hon Mr Rae:** If I'm not mistaken, the federal Tory party funded an entire museum dedicated to humour in the city of Montreal, so that party has certainly gone a little further than that. I know we have to be so solemn in this business, and I apologize. No, I don't. I just want to say directly in response that I don't believe the Premier of the province—

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** Fish ties? All that? Come on.

**Hon Mr Rae:** The member from London is almost out of control at this point.

**Mrs Cunningham:** That's not fair. If you want to see out of control, Bob, I'll show you out of control. Go to a ball game with me, Bob. I'll show you out of control.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Now she's heckling me mercilessly.

I would say to the leader of the third party that, apart from anything else, I just don't think it's right for the Premier of the province or for the government to tell the Ontario Arts Council what it should do. We have an arm's-length relationship with an agency. They have a funded allocation. Those decisions are not made by us, any more than the Canada Council decisions are made by the federal government. Once you establish arm's-length funding, it seems to me you'd better respect the integrity of that process.

**Mr Harris:** Premier, you have selectively interpreted when you should intervene and when you shouldn't. Certainly, there are many who believe that those types of grants to the CAW have occurred because of your government and your involvement and your appointments.

However, let me ask you this: For someone who has hiked your own government's spending this year while taking an additional \$2 billion of taxpayers' dollars, saying you're going to, and stating the intention of taking \$2 billion from the social contract partners, I would suggest to you that, given your inability to control your own government spending, you should be jumping at any plan to help identify savings from across all of the ministries and all of the programs.

Our plan would look at incentives for employees who can find savings. It would oversee whistle-blowing legislation. It would review the usefulness of programs such as the year-end spending. It would not allow and not tolerate something you condemned in this place when I raised it, that was the Ontario Housing Corp year-end spending binge and 5% increases. You and I agreed that was nonsense and should stop, but your minister defended it.

I would ask you this: You've given a general support that you'll look at it. Will you sit down with me and the leader of the Liberal Party, if it actually wishes to control spending as well, something it didn't do for the last eight years, to put in place, as part of this amendment, a truly non-partisan expenditure review committee to start to get the expenses of this government under control?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I think the rhetoric behind the question belies the first answer that I gave. Maybe he wasn't expecting the answer that I gave so he had to denounce me for giving a positive answer.

I indicated to him as clearly as I could that, in addition to treasury board, in addition to the processes, I'm quite prepared, I'd say directly to the leader of the third party, to sit down with the honourable member and

with others and look at other ways in which we can establish mechanisms for expenditure review. I can assure you the workers in the public sector are very interested in this as well. So if there's a way we can find together to do that, that's great.

What I would take from this, however, is that the leader of the third party is saying that he's interested in getting Bill 48, after a long couple of days' debate, into committee of the whole so that in fact we can consider amendments. I would say on that score that I fully agree with him. Let's get on with the amendments.

**Mr Harris:** The Premier can conclude exactly that. That's my intention and the sooner the better.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My second question is to the Premier as well. As you know, my caucus has set up a task force on justice, community safety and crime. Just last Thursday we held a public forum, for example, in St Catharines.

By a margin of two to one, Ontarians believe that they and their families face greater dangers in their own community than at any time in the past number of years. Also, the crime statistics justify that fear and concern. I think you would agree that we as legislators should be doing everything we can to prevent the increase of crime.

Therefore, can you explain to me why, during a time of increasing fear and concern among Ontarians, you would invite into the province of Ontario an increase in criminal activity by bringing big-time casino gambling to this province?

1450

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I think I'll give that question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I'm sorry that I didn't quite get the question, but I believe the question was, why are we introducing casino gambling in Windsor at this time? Is that correct? Okay.

As I've said before in the House, when we first decided to introduce casino gambling, when we first decided to move slowly and cautiously and set up a casino in Windsor, one of the things that we heard from people and one of the things that we decided to review and had concerns about ourselves was crime and its possible relation to casinos. Obviously, when you have a large facility brought into a town of any sort, there is going to be somewhat increased crime. That's not just for casinos but for any large facility that brings a lot of people with it. From the very beginning, we brought in all of the police community, at their request, to work with us to make sure that the concerns of the community would be looked at from day one, so that we can be assured that the casino will be crime-free.



**Mr Harris:** I say to the minister and the Premier, or the minister of justice, if it gets bounced there—I never know whom I'm addressing here—that the facts are these: Our police forces are being asked to cut back at a time when 85% of Ontarians—88% of the women in this province—believe that crime in the province has increased, that they are not as safe in their neighbourhoods as they once were, yet our scarce police resources are being directed towards these kinds of things in the past month. Intelligence officers with the OPP and Windsor police have been recruited to keep an eye on mobsters and others whom they are concerned about as a result of the Windsor casino project.

According to the Toronto Star last Friday, a special casino squad is being set up, funded out of the existing programs, taking resources away from police in our neighbourhoods, on our streets, to handle "the expected influx of underworld activity." I would ask the minister this: If you're the one who's now responding on behalf of justice issues and on behalf of the police and the deteriorating sense of wellbeing that women in particular have in their homes and in their neighbourhoods, do you think this is a good use of the very limited police resources, spending them on this kind of activity?

**Hon Ms Churley:** Specifically in terms of the casino in Windsor, which I think I should direct my comments to, not being the minister for justice, the project team, when it was set up, was allocated a certain amount of money to give and contribute to police resources. I remember, when we first started talking about the possibility of a pilot project in Ontario, one of the concerns and the questions which was frequently asked of me by the third party was its concern about crime and what we would be doing about that. I made darned certain that one of the first things that we looked at when we set up this project team and set up a process by which we can make sure that we're dealing up front with possible crime that may be related to a casino is taken care of. That's what the people of Ontario said to us and that is exactly what we're doing.

**Mr Harris:** To the newly appointed minister in charge of the allocation of police resources, let me ask you this: The Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police will be holding a panel on casino gambling at the annual general meeting in July, not a panel on how it deals with increasing crime, with increasing violence, with the increase in armed robberies, with the increase in murders, with the increases daily that we hear about and violence towards women. That's not what the panel is on; the police chiefs of Ontario panel is preparing itself for the increased crime due to your casino plans. Every officer and every policing dollar that goes towards casino crime or that kind of criminal activity is a dollar that's taken away from fighting the crime that currently exists on our streets. In the past two years, murders in Metro Toronto increased by nearly 10%;

sexual assaults up 18%; violent crimes up 12%.

Let me ask you this: How can you justify at this time, at a time of restraint when crime is on the increase, the police chiefs and the police resources going to fighting organized crime that we all know is going to come with your casinos?

**Hon Ms Churley:** Again I shall answer specifically to the casino project, but I think, to be fair to our police force, I would say to the leader of the third party that he's being a bit unfair in terms of the police force in Ontario and how it conducts its business. I'm sure that the police chiefs and the police community have conferences and seminars about many, many issues which they're trained to deal with.

There's a very small amount of the police force that has been allocated to deal with this particular project, just as there are some members of the police force directed to serve at the domed stadium. Just as any new facility or any new project that is set up in our community, it takes a certain amount of the police force, which is what it's paid to do, to protect the citizens of Ontario. This is just one facet of much of the work they are doing.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Premier, and it has to do with the social contract negotiations.

The Premier will know that a cornerstone of the social contract negotiations is the plan to cut the government's contributions to the pension by about a third. I think your plan is to reduce your spending in the pension plans by about \$500 million in each of the next three years. I think the Premier can appreciate that those on this side of the Legislature are worried about the basis on which that was arrived at and want to assure themselves that it is a responsible decision you're making.

I understand you have an actuarial report on it, but I wonder if you would give the House this assurance: that you will ask the pension boards that have responsibility for administering these plans to comment on your plans and to assure the House that we are not putting at risk future governments and future pensions by your plan to reduce your contribution by \$500 million a year for each of the next three years.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I will refer that to the Minister of Finance.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I believe the member from Scarborough-Agincourt understands the difference between the regular pension plan contributions and the special plan which was set up to look after the unfunded liability over a number of years. That was an agreement worked out between the Liberal Party when it was in office, and I think the member from Scarborough-Agincourt understands that.

What we are saying now is that the reduction of the \$500 million per year, if that's what transpires, will be reductions to that plan, not to the regular plan to which the employees and the government contribute based on the incomes of the teachers and the amount they will draw when they draw their pensions. So not one nickel of pension benefits will be touched by the decision, if that's what transpires, to reduce the government's payments by \$500 million a year for the next three years.

1500

**Mr Phillips:** The minister may not have heard my question. My question was, would you undertake to have the pension board give the Legislature an independent view on it? The minister just indicated that things are fine, but I have the annual report of the teachers' pension plan, and there's a chart here that shows the growth in the unfunded liability more than doubling over the next 15 years. It's not my report; it's the board's report. You can see that red line more than doubling, so you can appreciate why we on this side of the House are concerned that you're planning to spend \$500 million elsewhere that you had planned to spend on pensions.

I would just like the assurance of the government that we, on this side of the House, before you proceed with your plans, have an independent view on whether that is fiscally responsible, because if you look at the plan, I will assure you that the plan managers have a chart in their plan that shows the unfunded liability growing dramatically over the next few years.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** First of all, we would not withdraw or reduce our payments to that fund unless it was actuarially appropriate to do so. The member should understand that with a lower rate of inflation, with virtually no increases in wages or compensation for that sector for the next three years, the payout is going to be less and that, in our view, it makes actuarial sense, and we would not do it without actuarial justification for doing so.

Also, I have no problem at all with the pension board commenting on this, but I am sure it would do as we would do, make sure that there's actuarial justification for reduced payments into it as a result of what will eventually be reduced payments out of the fund.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** My question is for the Premier. It has to do with interprovincial trade barriers. As the Premier will know, the Conservative Party is strongly opposed to the fact that interprovincial trade barriers exist in this country. We're especially concerned about the restrictions placed on employees by the province of Quebec. Some of those, Mr Premier, have been in place for as much as 15 years, as you will appreciate.

They are so offensive that—I can give you one example of a few years ago. The city of Hull was forced to tear up sidewalks because the cement for the sidewalks was supplied from a supplier in the province of Ontario. That's the sort of situation that currently exists.

The Premier of New Brunswick, Mr Frank McKenna, has taken a long-overdue stand, brought on by years of frustration. The province of New Brunswick has finally done something, while your government continues to want to talk, talk, talk, while the Quebec negotiators laugh up their sleeves. Can you tell us why your government signed an agreement to continue this talking and negotiating process instead of taking firm action like the province of New Brunswick?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would say to the honourable member very directly that, first of all, this is a problem. It is a problem which the province has been facing for some time. When he was a member of the previous government, as the Minister of Government Services, I know he'll be aware of it from that time, when he was in the administration of the Conservative government. It was there then, and I don't recall him tearing anything up or walking away or blowing up any discussions.

I would just say to him directly that it is a problem. I would also say to him that a multilateral all-province or, in turn, bilateral agreement is better than unilateral action. Let me tell the member why.

Siemens, for example—Mr Speaker, this is going to take a little while—is a company that technically has headquarters in Quebec. It has extensive factories and locations in the province of Ontario. The president of Siemens Canada has come to me and said, "Under the New Brunswick rules, we are not now allowed to bid on projects in New Brunswick." This is a multinational company, and a company with extensive holdings in Ontario. I say to the honourable member, before the leader—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** No, no. You don't understand.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The leader of the third party, please come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I don't think the leader for the third party—

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Let me say to the leader of the third party that if he wants to heckle from his seat as he has done, he's got it wrong with respect to the potential impacts in Ontario; he doesn't understand the impacts.

I would say to him that there is a need for action. I



have indicated that very clearly to the government of Quebec, and we are open and we are entering into discussions with the government of Quebec in the context of the multilateral negotiations that are taking place. These rules need to come down, these rules need to be changed, but I would be wary of our escalating the war at this point.

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** That does not mean that we're not determined to get this problem settled and get it dealt with. I would say to the leader of the third party that he really is a little out of line in some of the comments that he's made, because I don't think he appreciates the impacts which unilateral action can have, which is why we prefer bilateral understanding. We are determined to act, however, because it is a problem.

**Mr Runciman:** That's essentially empty rhetoric. It means absolutely nothing to Ontario businesses losing jobs or to the hundreds of thousands of unemployed people in this province.

I want to give the Premier the other side of the coin. I have a letter here from a firm in my riding—I'd like the page to take it over to the Premier, if possible—Rehau plastics, which produces plastic pipes. They also have two operating businesses in the province of Quebec and they have an operation in Prescott, Ontario, but they're not able to supply pipe into Quebec because of the government-subsidized projects and because of the restrictions on the Quebec water purification corporation. As a result, they're losing jobs. They've been considering expansion at their plant in Prescott, but it is difficult to justify when Canada's second-largest provincial market is closed to our products.

That's a company operating in this province. They can't expand and they can't create new jobs because of this restrictive legislation placed upon them by the province of Quebec.

Mr Premier, when are you going to stop treating Quebec with kid gloves and stand up for Ontario workers and employers against Quebec's anti-Canada trade restrictions?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that we are entering into bilateral negotiations with the province of Quebec. That's very clear. I would say to the honourable member that we have made it very clear to the government of Quebec that we consider its practices to be unacceptable in the context of a Canadian common market. We've made that position very clear to the government of Quebec. There's no doubt at all with respect to our position.

I would also say to him that when you represent the largest province, as we do, our authority and our power has to be exercised with a degree of discretion. But I want to assure him that this matter is directly in front of

the government, we are dealing with it very directly and we do not regard the discrimination against producers that are based in Ontario as acceptable at all. It is not acceptable. It is an historic practice that must stop, and we are determined, through a process of negotiation, to get the practices stopped. That's precisely the position of the government of Ontario.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** My question's to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Many Hamilton-Wentworth-area residents depend greatly on two major Canadian steel manufacturers: Stelco and Dofasco. The dependency is not limited to just jobs, but is also on the many other spinoffs deriving from steel manufacturing.

The United States' imposition of dump duties against Ontario's integrated steel producers is of significance and is a great cause for concern to thousands of people in the Hamilton-Wentworth area. In fact, I'm sure there are others concerned all across Ontario. What is the outcome of the United States Department of Commerce's final steel dumping ruling, and how will it affect the Ontario steel industry?

1510

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** The US Department of Commerce arrived at its final decision yesterday. It was released today. It's not good news for the steel industry in this country, so it's bad news for our province, given how important that sector is to us.

The final dumping rulings actually increased the margins in the majority of areas. Plate steel remained about the same, but hot-rolled and cold-rolled steel, in particular, were increased beyond what was even expected might be the result. This is very upsetting news with respect to the ruling.

I have to say that our view of this is that these duties against Canada are unwarranted and unsupportable. There's no question that they are implementing duties against what we see as an integrated North American steel market where our companies are selling at a North American price. The findings of the US Department of Commerce are just not supportable in any way.

This dispute has been going on for a long time. I want to point out that this is the third in a four-point decision process. We expect that we will have shortly the final ruling with respect to injury and at that point in time we'll know whether the margins will be maintained or not.

#### *Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I have to say that we view this as a continuation of trade harassment. This is not something that has been ended by the FTA or NAFTA, as I hear members across the floor heckling at this point in time.

**Mr Abel:** If Canadian steel firms and US steel firms are both selling in the same market at North American prices, it appears that the whole steel dispute is about trade harassment and protectionism. Why is it that Canadian firms are still being harassed by protectionist US interests when we have a Canadian and US free trade agreement and we have recently signed the North American free trade agreement?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** It was hard to hear the whole question. I tried to listen. With respect to the trade harassment, as we see it and as the steel industry clearly sees it, there is no relief currently under the free trade agreement, as we had hoped and had been promised by previous governments, with respect to bringing an end to these kinds of actions.

At this point in time, we do have to await the finding on injury. If there's a negative finding on that, then the dumping margins will not be implemented. But I have to say that there was recently a case which the Canadian industry brought against a number of US firms, in retaliation for the case that was here, which went through the system. In the first of those cases the Canadian trade tribunal found that there was no injury.

This is another problem we have in that the trade rules are different in both countries. They're much more stringent in Canada than the US. It leaves us open for dumping of cheap products from European markets and others. This is clearly a fault that should have been corrected in the free trade agreement, should have been corrected in NAFTA, and wasn't.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** What I can assure the member is that we will be sitting down with the steel industry this week to assess these cases and to take further actions with it.

#### RETAIL SALES TAX

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** My question is for the Minister of Finance. In your budget, you proposed a new tax which is going to affect the brewing-on-premises industry in the province. The tax is going to grow over two years to 38 cents on every litre of beer or wine made by a customer on the premises. This industry is an all-too-rare growth industry in our recession, as you probably recognize. In just four short years, it has grown to 235 outlets owned by small business entrepreneurs who have sunk \$50 million into their businesses and who now employ over 2,000 Ontarians. The industry is obviously very concerned about the harm your new tax will cause and about your ability to withstand the pressure of the large, multi-billion-dollar brewing industry to proceed with this tax.

My question is this: What studies have you done to measure the impact of your new tax on the brewing-on-premises industry?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** My son asked me a very similar question after the budget.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** You had no answer for him, either, did you?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If the member for Oriole ever would make a speech or ask a question, I could understand that she sees the need to heckle, but she does nothing except heckle in this House. Why is that?

**Mrs Caplan:** Touchy, touchy.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I wonder if I could attempt to shout over the heckling of the member for Oriole to the member who asked a serious question, I thought. I will try and take the question more seriously than his own colleagues do.

**Mrs Caplan:** It's a serious question, Floyd. See if you have an answer for this one.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

**Mrs Caplan:** See if you have an answer for this one.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm sorry, the member from Oriole's asking a supplementary.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Perhaps the minister has an answer brewing.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It seems that questions to deal with the brewing industry bring out the best in people in this assembly.

I did think seriously about the you-brew industry when we imposed the tax, but in the end my feeling was that it is a commercial establishment and that there was no reason why it should be exempt.

I think there has been some confusion out there, which is one reason I appreciate the question. There is some sense among some people out there in the province that we were taxing people who brewed their own beer at home, and that of course is not the case. It's simply a tax on the you-brew establishments, which are in fact commercial establishments, and in my view should be paying the tax.

**Mr McGuinty:** I take it from that response that the minister has not in fact conducted any kind of formal study which would lead him to gain an understanding and a recognition of the implications of this tax policy.

You're probably aware, Mr Minister, that this industry obviously pays the usual array of taxes: these sales taxes, employment taxes, business taxes and property taxes. What you are now doing, essentially, is imposing an additional tax on these small business entrepreneurs and you are, recognize it or not, trying to stifle the very kind of economic growth this province desperately needs.

The brew-on-premises people tell me that you have told them you can't meet with them this year. These are reasonable people, and they ask two things of you. First of all, they want a meeting with you before August 1,



and secondly, they want a one-year moratorium on your new tax in order to prepare, in consultation with you or your officials, a responsible taxation program, one that won't kill their industry. Will you agree to these two reasonable requests, the meeting and the moratorium?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I certainly will not agree to a one-year moratorium on the tax. I think, to put it in perspective, that the tax that has been put on the you-brew establishments, is still very significantly less than the tax that's on the regular beer establishments. As a matter of fact, it's more than half, but I don't think it's even two thirds of the tax that's on the regular beer that you buy from the major breweries. So I don't believe it's an onerous tax burden.

As a matter of fact, the information I received from several sources was that the you-brew industry was indeed expecting this tax, and in some cases there was a sigh of relief that it was not even heavier than it was. I think, to put it in perspective, that it's not an onerous burden on the industry.

1520

#### CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** My question was for the Minister of Natural Resources, but in his absence I would like to direct it to the Minister of Finance.

Last week the member for Grey had the satisfaction of presenting a resolution in the Legislature which received the approval of this House by a vote of, I think, about 32 to 28. All members present were very pleased with the content of the resolution and the fact that it passed. I assume you're aware that the resolution covered the rebate to the conservation authorities; so my question is, will you consider restoring that tax rebate through the ministry to the conservation authorities?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Yes, I was indeed aware of that event in the Legislature last week. The member may recall that was the result of an exercise this government engaged in, in which we were looking at ways to reduce our expenditures all across government. There were no easy decisions in that regard. I certainly have heard from backbenchers in the government of their concern about this particular cancellation of a rebate. But I can say to the member that it is not our intention to cancel that program, although I am very much aware of the concern that's been raised by members on all sides of the House.

**Mr Jordan:** Thank you, Mr Minister. Since you have chosen really to ignore the resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly, I would assume that you have in mind another more effective plan to save the conservation authorities from selling off their land. It was indicated by the Minister of Natural Resources that this could be the case, and I ask you now, would you tell the House what that plan is?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It's my understanding that the Minister of Natural Resources is, as a matter of fact, sitting down with the conservation authorities to discuss this whole question of alternatives to the disposition of land by the conservation authorities as a result of the cancellation of the rebate. It certainly isn't our intention to encourage conservation authorities to do that, and that's why the Minister of Natural Resources has agreed to sit down with the conservation authorities in the province to see what the alternatives might be.

#### SMALL BUSINESS

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York):** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Madam Minister, I've formed a small business working group in my riding of Fort York, where we have 16,000 small companies. These businesses have enthusiastically welcomed the opportunity to work together with me to address their concerns about the role of the provincial government in economic renewal.

As you know, Madam Minister, small businesses have created an impressive 85% of all new jobs in Canada over the last decade, but they face obstacles: a lack of access to working capital; excessive red tape and taxation; and a sense that provincial governments, past and present, do not see local businesses as part of a vibrant community economy.

We have discussed many issues to date and there has been considerable interest in hearing what the government is doing to improve the prospects for small businesses. Since the budget announcement regarding Jobs Ontario Community Action, I have been asked many times what role small businesses will have in this new program. Madam Minister, will this program have anything to offer small businesses?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I thank the member for his question. I'm sure I'll have similar questions to that when I have the opportunity to join with him at the next meeting of the Fort York small business working group, which is coming up this week.

As a government, we see community economic development as a way of supporting local economic development priorities that are planned by local communities in a way that encourages community-wide participation, and the initiative under the Jobs Ontario Community Action that the member asked about has three specific components to it: There's community development, community capital and community financing.

I think the community financing component is probably the part of the program that will be of most significant interest to small businesses. That part of the component is currently being addressed and debated in this House right now under Bill 40, which is under the stewardship of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

The legislation addresses the problem of inadequate access to capital, which is a serious problem for small businesses at this point in time, and it looks at how local entrepreneurs and small businesses can qualify for loans that are sponsored by local pools of capital put together from local communities. Under the legislation, communities will be given the tools they require in terms of community loan funds and setting up community investment share corporations for both loans and equity investment.

I'd be pleased to give the member more information on that and to have some details available for the members of his community. I urge all the members in the Legislature to take a look at this important vehicle to help finance local businesses.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to welcome to our assembly this afternoon, seated in the members' gallery west, as he has been for the entire question period, the former member for Lambton, Mr David Smith.

#### PETITIONS

##### SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** I have another petition that has come from people from the Belleville-Trenton-Quinte area concerning the school for the deaf, Sir James Whitney School, and if I may, I'll read it:

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education proposes to substantially modify the provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled by either downsizing, closing parts of or restructuring the schools, resulting in significant hardship for students, families, employees and the local community for the purpose of saving money; and

"Whereas the Sir James Whitney Parents Association believes that quality education delivered today within the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning disabled provides the lowest total-cost option available while allowing deaf students to wholly develop within their own culture and to receive the best education possible;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"(1) Maintain the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled until an acceptable model from all interested parties has been developed; and

"(2) Empower local boards of trustees as set out in model 5 to manage their own budgets within ministry guidelines and funding."

Mr Speaker, I support this and have affixed my signature to these.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Mr Speaker, it says:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling (Macdonald and Macdonald, *Pathological Gambling: The Problem, Treatment and Outcome*, Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling); and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

That has 28 signatures from Orillia, Washago, Severn Bridge, Kilworthy, Toronto, and I have affixed my name to it.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have here a petition signed by hundreds of students from my riding, students like Tyler Astles, Tim Clancy, Dave Massey, Todd Bainbridge and Mike King, who are concerned about their future, and their petition says:

"Whereas we feel that the Canada-US free trade deal has done immeasurable damage to the economy of the province of Ontario, causing the loss of more than 45,000 in Ontario alone; and

"Whereas we feel that the proposed North American free trade arrangement will have an even more devastating effect on Ontario resulting in a loss of not only more jobs, but also a reduction in our environmental standards, our labour standards, our workers rights and our overall quality of life;

"We petition the Legislature of Ontario in Toronto to fight this trade deal with whatever means possible; and

"We petition the House of Commons in Ottawa to stop this deal now."

Mr Speaker, I think it's only my right to present these petitions and not be harassed by the opposition while doing so.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** "To the



Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers;

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

Mr Speaker, it is signed by 32 of my constituents and I have affixed my signature.

1530

#### GO BUS SERVICE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To object to the recent cuts to GO Transit bus service for Woodbridge, Kleinburg, Nobleton, Bolton, Palgrave and Highway 9.

"Whereas this will be a major inconvenience to non-drivers; and

"Whereas it will have a negative impact on the local economy; and

"Whereas the lack of transit services will increase traffic, thereby increasing air pollution levels at a time when all levels of government are making efforts to reduce pollution and encourage public transportation systems; and

"Whereas the cuts leave no alternative means of commuting in and out of Toronto during peak hours; and

"Whereas the lack of GO buses will force passengers in one of the worst economic times in Ontario history to incur extra expense, finding another form of transportation;

"It is resolved that the government of Ontario overturn GO Transit's decision and restore GO Transit service to Bolton and Palgrave."

I've identified my signature on this petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Daniel Waters (Muskoka-Georgian Bay):** I have a petition today from a number of people in the Bala and Port Carling area of my riding, members of the United Church there. They are opposed to the gambling casinos being established and ask that the government cease to establish all gambling casinos in the province of Ontario.

#### CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I have another of a continuing series of petitions, another 500 names here from the constituents of Timiskaming:

"Premier Rae, Treasurer Laughren, Minister Buchanan:

"We, the undersigned, request that you seriously consider reversing your decision to close the New Liskeard College of Agricultural Technology."

I affix my signature to this petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'd like to read into the record again many, many petitions against this awful policy of casino gambling:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries"—that you would expect from the government—"and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976"—and again the other day—"voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos in this province."

This is eminent good sense and I'm going to put my signature to this. I hope the government listens for a change.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** I have another petition here pertaining to the Sir James Whitney School at Belleville with 341 signatures, over and above 500 and some signatures which were put together by Tom and Linda Sirvage, who have two of their children attending the Sir James Whitney School at Belleville, and they're very concerned. The petition reads as follows:

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education proposes to substantially modify the provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled by either downsizing, closing

parts of or restructuring the schools, resulting in significant hardship for students, families, employees and the local community for the purpose of saving money; and

"Whereas the Sir James Whitney Parents' Association believes that quality education delivered today within the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled provides the lowest total cost option available while allowing deaf students to wholly develop within their own culture and to receive the best education possible;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario:

"(1) Maintain the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled until an acceptable model for all interested parties has been developed; and

"(2) Empower local boards of trustees as set out in model 5 to manage their own budgets within ministry guidelines and funding."

I fully support this petition and I have signed it.

#### WASTE DISPOSAL

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I have a petition here to the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario Waste Management Corp is proposing to build and operate a huge centralized toxic waste incinerator and landfill site in the heart of Ontario's farm land of Niagara;

"Whereas toxic waste must be treated at the source because transportation of such huge volumes of toxic waste on our highways is suicidal;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to change the mandate and directions being promoted by this crown corporation, the Ontario Waste Management Corp."

Over 51 families have signed from the Niagara area: St Catharines, Fonthill and Niagara Falls. I affix my signature to this petition.

#### CONTRAT SOCIAL

**M. Jean Poirier (Prescott et Russell) :** J'ai en ma possession trois pétitions identiques signées par 60 personnes de la circonscription de Prescott et Russell. Elles sont adressées à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

«Attendu que nous sommes en désaccord avec la façon de procéder de Monsieur Rae face à la coalition ;

«Nous, soussignés, adressons à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario la pétition suivante :

«Monsieur Bob Rae, nous sommes très inquiets de la situation présente en Ontario. Il ne semble pas que vous soyez à l'écoute des solutions que vous proposent les gens de la coalition, ni même à l'écoute de la population. Nous désirons savoir exactement ce que vous avez l'intention de faire pour sortir la province de son déficit, sans pour cela rendre la vie des gens impossible, en leur faisant subir des coupures draconiennes venant de vous

et des employeurs. Cela ne créerait certes pas un climat de travail et risquerait certainement d'affecter la qualité des services offerts.»

J'ai apposé ma signature et je l'appuie à 100 %.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I have a petition from Dianne Gow in Waterloo.

"To the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows: .

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

It has been signed by about 70 people in Kitchener and Waterloo.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mrs Ellen MacKinnon (Lambton):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the need for a safe, secure source of potable water has been established in the township of Bosanquet; and

"Whereas the necessary engineering and planning has been completed for a regional water pipeline; and

"Whereas the completion of this project would be expedited by the support of the government of Ontario with funding through Jobs Ontario Capital;

"Therefore, the undersigned respectfully submit this enclosed petition for the consideration of the Legislature of Ontario."

I endorse this petition and will sign the same.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I have a petition.

"To the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;



"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

That is signed by about 1,500 of my constituents, and I have affixed my signature as well.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** I have a petition from the Blyth United Church to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling (Macdonald and Macdonald, Pathological Gambling: The Problem, Treatment and Outcome, Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling); and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

I have signed my name. This is from 33 people from Blyth United Church.

1540

#### REGISTRAR GENERAL

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the office of the registrar general under the authority of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations is unable to maintain a reasonable level of service for the people of Ontario; and

"Whereas the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations has been unable to reduce delays for amendments, changes of name, delayed registrations, marriage and birth registrations,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government undertake a broad review of the operations of the office of the registrar general with a view to reducing the delays for processing requests in the aforementioned departments."

That's signed by 24 residents of my riding and I've also signed the petition.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### REPORT, STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Deferred vote on the motion for adoption of the report of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs on Bill 164, An Act to amend the Insurance Act and certain other Acts in respect of Automobile Insurance and other Insurance Matters / Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances et certaines autres lois en ce qui concerne l'assurance-automobile et d'autres questions d'assurance.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Pursuant to an arrangement made yesterday, we are now moving into a vote which had been delayed to today. We will have a five-minute bell. Call in the members.

*The division bells rang from 1542 to 1547.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will all members please take their seats. We are now proceeding to vote on Mr Johnson's, representing the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings, report from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs.

All those in favour of adopting the report as presented will please rise one at a time to be identified by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Abel, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Haack, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rizzo, Silipo, Swarbrick, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to accepting the report as represented, please rise one at a time to be identified by the table.

#### Nays

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Cleary, Conway, Daigeler, Drainville, Eddy, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Johnson (Don Mills), Jordan, Kormos, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McClelland, McGuinty, McLean, Miclash, Murdoch (Grey), Murphy, O'Neil (Quinte), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Poirier, Ramsay, Runciman, Ruprecht, Sola, Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Turnbull, Wilson (Simcoe West), Witmer.

**The Acting Speaker:** The ayes are 59; the nays 43. I therefore declare the report accepted as presented. Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 8, 1993, this bill is ordered now for third reading.

SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** The honourable member for Willowdale had the floor when we last debated this bill.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** As I began last night I made mention of the fact that the member for Renfrew North had just completed debating this issue and had indicated, contrary to what the member for Oriole keeps saying, support in principle for this bill—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Having many private conversations makes it very difficult for the member for Willowdale, who has the floor, and very difficult for the Speaker to hear what he's saying. Would you please, if you have conversations that you want to maintain, do it in a quiet fashion.

**Mr Harnick:** At any rate, I keep listening to the member from Oriole telling me about what my party's position is. Quite frankly, I think everybody in this place wants to know what her party's position is. Her leader has said they're opposed to this legislation. The deputy leader of the party, the member from Renfrew North, stood in his place last night and eloquently debated and said that, in principle, he's all in favour of the concept of restraint.

I don't know where my friends in the Liberal Party are going with this, but I don't think there's any question that we in this party have been preaching the concept of restraint since the day we were elected in 1990. We continue to preach the concept of restraint and, lo and behold, three years later the Treasurer is finally listening to us.

I think it's very important that the public understands some of the numbers that got us into the trouble that we're in now. From 1985 to 1987 we had an accord between the socialist NDP and the socialist Liberal parties. They got together and the one thing that they decided to do was to spend big time. They had more programs that they were going to spend money on and

they had more improvements that they were going to make to this province than had ever been made before. They began an orgy of spending in 1985, the two parties together, one holding the gun to the other's head. They began this orgy of spending to the point that the province is now bankrupt.

That went on from 1985 to 1987, when they were in bed together, and it continued in 1987 to 1990, after they'd had the divorce. So the spending up to that time had been unprecedented.

It's interesting to know that as of 1990, the then Premier, Mr Peterson, had to know that something was going to happen, that something around the corner was not good, because he was telling us in September 1990 that the budget was a balanced budget. In fact, it was a \$3.5-billion deficit. That's what the socialist NDP government inherited. They inherited a \$3.5-billion deficit and they inherited a province that was on the brink of economic collapse. That's what happened in September 1990.

From that point on, they embarked upon a plan to right the economic problems of this province and they did that by continuing the orgy of Liberal spending and by continuing heavy deficit financing. There had been deficit financing in prior years, but there had never been deficit financing of \$3.5 billion like there was under the Liberal government. There had never been deficit financing to the extent of \$10.9 billion—

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Under the rules of procedure, members of the House are not supposed to mislead this House. Information they give is supposed to be factual, and I would ask you to call the member to order because his information is simply not correct.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The honourable member will have the opportunity of replying.

**Mrs Caplan:** Why don't you tell the truth? I'm not allowed to say he's misleading. Don't say I can't say he's misleading—

**The Acting Speaker:** Please, we're all honourable members here.

**Mrs Caplan:** An honourable member tells the truth.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Willowdale has the floor.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Oriole turned around to the member for Willowdale and said, "That's crap." Is that proper parliamentary language?

**Mrs Caplan:** That's not true.

**Mr Sterling:** That is true.

**Mrs Caplan:** That isn't.

**Mr Sterling:** That's exactly what you said.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Of course it's not parliamentary. The Speaker did not hear it. Does the



member for Oriole want to reply?

**Mrs Caplan:** Mr Speaker, on my point of order: The member from Willowdale has provoked me by the fact that he is giving false information to this House. If he were giving factual information to this House, I would not be provoked.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Willowdale has the floor. Please resume.

**Mr Harnick:** I only can say that she protesteth too much.

The Liberals told us in September 1990 that the budget was balanced. They told the electorate that the budget was balanced. Well, lo and behold, the NDP took over and there was a \$3.5-billion deficit. Those are the facts: \$3.5 billion after 33 tax increases, after unprecedented revenues, and there was \$3.5 billion of deficit.

Then the NDP socialist Treasurer took over and he said, "You know, that \$3.5 billion is not enough," and the Treasurer then decided that he was going to purchase prosperity. He was going to go out and purchase prosperity and he said there was going to be a \$9.7-billion deficit. Lo and behold, he was wrong; there was a \$10.9-billion deficit. But that deficit was deliberately created. There was no attempt to cut spending. There was no attempt to cut taxation. There was no attempt to stimulate the economy. There was a deliberate plan to spend money to stimulate and to run a deficit to stimulate.

The Treasurer, sitting in his place today, will be the first person to admit, because he's an honourable gentleman, that his plan failed. His plan failed, but he didn't realize after the first budget that his plan failed so he went ahead and he brought us another budget, and the next budget came in at \$11.9 billion in the hole.

People on this side of the House were hyperventilating. The Treasurer offered us paper bags to help us get enough oxygen in our lungs. In two years of NDP government, we were now over \$20 billion of deficits.

1600

The Treasurer finally started to get nervous, and he finally started to say, "I haven't bought prosperity." Furthermore, because of the labour relations bill, Bill 40, we've had an even greater dip in the economy, the private sector has not been stimulated, and lo and behold, we now reach the third year and the most recent budget, where we have a projection, and it won't be right, of \$9.2 billion of deficit.

Lo and behold, in that atmosphere, the NDP decided, the government decided that they were wrong in terms of their big spending, so now they've decided to embark on a plan of even bigger taxation and restraint. Well, I haven't seen the restraint they keep talking about. There's supposed to be \$2 billion in spending cuts. Page

92 of the budget says that there might be \$147 million in spending cuts. So the spending cuts are not there. They cut money that they might have wanted to spend and realized they couldn't; \$147 million, that's all the savings that there were.

But we know for sure that the Treasurer is telling the truth when he tells us about the \$2-billion tax increase. That is the truth. That is the very sad truth. There's a \$2-billion tax grab. That's one of the legs of the stool.

The final aspect to all this was the fact that we are now going to try and achieve \$2 billion in cuts from the employees of this province, directly and indirectly. I, quite frankly, and the members of my party are supportive of that leg of the stool because it's part of a general restraint package that has to be there. There's no question of it.

The problem, and what makes it very hard to swallow for those in unions and for those who work for the government is that the government itself has not done its part in terms of sharing in the pain and the misery. The government has not cut its spending to the degree that taxpayers have been asked to ante up and to the degree that government employees have been asked to ante up, and that makes this very hard to swallow.

In all of this, where are my friends in the Liberal Party? Well, one minute they're going to fight this restraint package, they're going to vote against it, and the next minute, at 11:30 at night, the deputy leader of that party says, "In principle, we're all for it."

**Mrs Caplan:** Not this legislation.

**Mr Harnick:** I didn't say the legis—the member from Oriole has a habit of interrupting but not listening. What I said, and I'll say it for her again, is that the Liberal deputy leader indicated that in principle he is in favour of restraint. I did not say that he was in favour of this piece of legislation. But the member for Oriole doesn't like to listen. She has a very selective memory, as do all of the other members of her party and caucus.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think the member from Willowdale is making some fine comments on Bill 48, and there should be some Liberals here to hear them, so I'm calling quorum.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is there a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Willowdale may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Harnick:** Just so people don't think I'm becoming overly partisan about my comments, I have certain comments about where the Liberals stand and what alternatives they offer to a very difficult problem. I've

heard none, in spite of the new style of politics that they're going to engage in, the constructive style of politics.

But I can quote from the *Ottawa Citizen*, June 4, 1993. Here's what a reporter who sits in the press gallery on a regular basis, a very objective individual, says:

"During recent question period exchanges, Rae"—I assume he's referring to Robert K. Rae QC—"has had much to work with. He claims, with credibility, that he is dealing with what the Liberals didn't during the gravy days of the 1980s.

"On controlling health costs,' he bellows at McLeod, 'you avoided it the entire time you were in office, five years of evasion.'"

I might just add, those were increases in spending, year over year, in excess of 10% every year.

**Interjection:** Less than you guys spent, lower than you rate of growth.

**Mr Harnick:** Yes, but the inflation rate when we were in government was different from when you were in government.

I might tell the member from Oriole, who's again laughing, that when the Conservative Party ran this province we had a triple A credit rating. We don't have that today and we didn't have that after the Liberals finished with their double-digit spending and taxing. Oh, here we go.

**Mrs Caplan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Willowdale, as an honourable member, has an obligation to tell the truth. He has an obligation as a member of this House to make sure he gets his facts straight.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Oriole will have an opportunity of setting all her facts straight when her turn comes. The member for Willowdale has the floor and can resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Harnick:** I'll give the member from Oriole some other numbers. Her party went from 96 seats to 36 seats, and if those numbers don't speak volumes, no numbers do.

But any rate, let's see what else Jim Coyle had to say. He said:

"On controlling health costs,' he bellows at McLeod, 'you avoided it the entire time you were in office, five years of evasion.'"

"The Premier correctly notes that he has been provided with virtually nothing by way of serious alternatives proposed by the Grits."

Another quote is:

"I know the game that she's playing. To every aggrieved group out there she's going to say, 'Well, I'll advocate for you and I'll advocate for this and I'll advocate for that.'"

That's exactly what the Liberal Party is doing. They have not provided one single alternative on how this problem can be solved.

It's very interesting. The Premier came along and proposed this package of legislation. I'll tell you, it's very difficult, it's going to be fraught with problems, there's no question of that, but my party immediately—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think we should have a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West has requested that the table check to see if we have a quorum. A quorum is present. The member for Willowdale may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Harnick:** At any rate, as I was saying, when this piece of legislation was delivered, my party—and I'm quite proud to say this—immediately proposed ways that this piece of legislation could be made more workable. The very first thing was to propose a three-year hiring freeze which has the potential to reduce the annual cost of public sector compensation by over \$2 billion in the third year, a public sector wage freeze that would commence on the anniversary date of all contracts and continue for three years from that date.

It's very interesting, because as of yesterday, last evening, the Premier even agreed that was the proper way to do it and he now is talking about implementing this at the conclusion of existing contracts, because now the Premier understands that it's important not to gut collective agreements. It was our party, I might tell my friends across the way, that suggested this alternative.

We've also proposed whistle-blower provisions to protect public servants who report fraud, waste or other abuses from workplace retribution while netting substantial additional savings.

We've proposed provisions to discourage government departments from spending their entire budgets within the fiscal year, eliminating year-end burnoff or face rollbacks.

1610

Now, we know that the Ministry of Housing, at the end of this fiscal year, because it had more money, was giving away 5% raises for the next year: quite improper at a time when we should be showing restraint. The Premier acknowledged that, although the Minister of Housing has never acknowledged that. I'd like to hear what the conversations between the Premier and his minister have been like over the last several months.

We've proposed performance bonuses for public servants based on efficiencies and productivity gains similar to private sector agreements such as those involving the Canadian Auto Workers union. We've proposed a very significant proposal: establishment of an expenditure review committee to identify non-productive government programs and to prioritize existing programs, all of these suggestions aimed at



providing constructive means by which this piece of legislation will work.

We in this party recognize that governments have been spending too much money, governments have been taxing too much money, and governments are trying to be all things to all people and they can't do it. We have taken the position that restraint is necessary and that we wish to be constructive in determining the kind of restraint that we believe should take place.

That's why we're offering constructive proposals. We don't just criticize. That's the old way of doing things, to be shrill and to shout and to criticize and not to offer any constructive alternatives. We don't do that. We are trying to be constructive in terms of the way we look at this particular piece of legislation.

I remember, and late last night when I began speaking I alluded to this, when I first came to this place in September 1990 and we used to talk about smaller government and restraint, the Liberal Party and the government laughed at us. They thought it was funny. They treated those suggestions with complete and utter disdain. Well, the one thing that gives me great satisfaction is to be able to stand here today and say, "I told you so."

Quite frankly, I would bet that there's not a person on the government side who would argue with that. They were all wrong when they came here and thought they could tax big and spend big and carry on indefinitely. The reality is that the Liberals did not leave you an economy that could sustain the size of government that they created. They created a civil service that went from 80,142 in March 1985 to 88,267 in March 1990.

If those numbers aren't accurate, I'd like somebody to jump up and tell me. But I tell you, that's a fact, Mr Speaker. That is a fact. It was very quiet from the opposition party when I mentioned those statistics: 80,142 in March 1985, jumping to 88,267 in March 1990. That's 8,000 people.

Then, to boot, with this government which assumed power in September 1990, one of the very first things they did was they froze the salaries of all the MPPs in this place. I think that was quite proper. They quite properly recognized that the NDP had inherited a \$3.5-billion deficit, that the economy was slowing down, and they went ahead and they froze our salaries.

But what I can't understand is why they then went ahead and started giving out wage increases to the Ontario Public Service Employees Union of 14.5%. I tell you today that if you ask those same Ontario Public Service Employees Union individuals whether they would have accepted 2% then for a guarantee of a job today, they would have said: "Keep the 14%; I'll take the 2%, because that's what inflation's running at, because I want a guaranteed job. That's what's important to me and my family."

I can't understand for the life of me how the government knew enough to freeze my salary, quite properly, and at the same time it was giving out wage settlements of 14.5%. How did that happen? I don't know. I don't know how that happened and quite frankly, it was at that particular point in time that the government then continued and made a decision to go on the spending binge that, between the NDP and the Liberals, has brought us to the point where we are today.

I am proud to say that our party, through that whole period of time, remained consistent. We remained consistent in saying what you're doing is wrong, what the Liberals did was wrong and to a very large degree what our party had done before that was wrong. You can't deficit-finance indefinitely, and that's what people around here tried to do.

But when we stood in 1990 and put those remarks on the record, and it's quite clear they are on the record, we only felt derision and disdain and mockery from our colleagues in the other parties, because no one was prepared to recognize the very grave situation that we were in, and I think we've reached this stage.

Just in the very brief few moments I have, I do have some significant concerns about the bill. I am very concerned that this particular bill gives enormous power to the Treasurer. The power the Treasurer receives under this bill is probably second to no power ever granted to an elected official in any other piece of legislation that has ever come before this Legislature.

**Mrs Caplan:** But you're going to support it.

**Mr Harnick:** The member from Oriole says but I'm going to support it. You know, the fact is if we don't come up with a restraint package now, the government cannot sustain itself. I understand that the Liberals have a stake in maintaining a civil service that is far too large, because they hired all those people. They created that huge civil service. They were the ones who have a stake in taxing people at very high rates, because they raised our taxes 33 times in but five years, and now they don't want to acknowledge that they were wrong.

At least I can say that the government sitting opposite me today, by the tack that it has taken, is at least acknowledging that what it has done for the last three years is wrong. By continuing Liberal policies for three years and creating high deficits they were wrong, but at least now they're turning in the right direction. The Liberals refused to acknowledge that.

The other very significant aspect of this bill that concerns me is the fact that there are certain aspects to our health care system that can be very much affected by the provisions of this bill. What I'm talking about is the way the government can now ration health care pursuant to this bill in a way that I think can be very detrimental to the people in this province.

Now the government assures us that: "Oh, we would

never do those things. We would never go ahead and take advantage, even though it's in the bill and by way of regulation that the health care rationing can take place." What I say is if you're never going to do those things, as the Minister of Health protested the other day, why do you need those things in the bill? Why do you need those extraordinary powers and why is there no check on what the Treasurer is able to do under this bill?

When we had the wage and price control bill of the Liberals in Ottawa in I believe 1979, we had the Anti-Inflation Review Board, an independent board that reviewed the implementation of that bill. Here we don't have that. All of the power rests with the Treasurer, and I think this is a very dangerous precedent.

But as I close, I say that I hope the government will accept the amendments that we will be proposing very shortly. The amendments will deal with the six points that I outlined earlier, and I believe they will make this bill workable and make this province economically more healthy in the future.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments? The member for Oriole.

1620

**Mrs Caplan:** I was very much provoked by the member for Willowdale, because much of the information that he put forward in his remarks in this House was simply inaccurate and false. I'd like to correct the record for him.

I want him to know that in fact in 1990 the NDP government inherited a triple A credit rating. They also inherited a fully balanced operating budget, and that budget had been fully balanced since 1987. The Provincial Auditor attested to the fact that after 15 consecutive years of Tory deficits—and the Liberals inherited an operating deficit from the Tories in 1985—the first fully balanced budget, including capital, occurred in this province, and it was the first fully balanced budget in 20 years, in the full fiscal year of 1989-90, which happened to be the last full year of the Liberal government.

We know as well that through the years from 1985 until 1990 Ontario led the western world in economic activity and created some 700,000 jobs. We know as well that the budget plan that Treasurer Nixon tabled in the spring of 1990 called for a 6.8% spending plan which, by the end of that year, the NDP had run up to 14.7%. The deficit in that budget at the end of that year, at the end of the six months that the NDP held the reins of power in this province, was then \$3 billion. That was still, I would point out, a budget that a fully balanced operating budget, because the capital budget in that year was \$3.2 billion.

We all know the difference between capital and operating, we know that the books of this province are

kept in an antiquated way, but the member for Willowdale must give factual information if he's not to mislead the people watching these debates.

**The Acting Speaker:** I want to remind members that you're coming awfully close to being unparliamentary. Please.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** While I've been provoked to rise for two minutes, I'll be very brief. But I want to commend the member on the speech that he gave because a lot of those figures that he gave were factual.

I've sat in this Legislature for over 12 years and I remember when the budget went from \$29 billion to almost \$40 billion under a Liberal administration from 1985 to 1990. I was here when the civil service was increased from 80,000 to 88,000 in that same administration. I was here when the corporate minimum tax was put on. I was here when the wealth tax was put on. I was here when the sales tax was increased from 7% to 8%. I was here when the commercial concentration tax was put on.

When I hear about 33 tax increases in five years and I hear the member for Oriole making the comment that what the member for Willowdale was saying is totally untrue, I find that very uncomplimentary due to the fact that it is bordering on what the Speaker has just said.

On the remarks that were made with regard to the social contract, I think the six proposals that our leader has put forward, and which have had great debate, are worth very serious consideration, because I'm for less government, less spending, and more concern with the job civil servants are doing. With regard to the conversations that have taken place back and forth in this House, it appears that they're not being complimented at all for the job that they're doing in this province. I think we have a very good civil service, but the fact is there's got to be a bottom line. There's got to be a freeze on hiring and a freeze on salaries.

Those people who have jobs out there should be quite happy and satisfied, because there are an awful of people in my community who are looking for work, very qualified people who need work to support their families. These people we have need it too.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? The member for Willowdale has two minutes in response.

**Mr Harnick:** I very briefly put to the member for Oriole, if your record was so good, why were you not re-elected? That speaks for itself.

The very key aspects of this social contract legislation are the importance of getting it done and the importance of minimizing and ending the uncertainty which our civil service is working under now. The fact that people who are long-time civil servants and dedicated employees of this province are living a day-to-day



existence of uncertainty—it cannot be easy for them to be going through this, wondering if they will have a job and will be able to provide for their families tomorrow. I urge the government to get on with it, to get on with its sectoral negotiating and not to continue extending the deadline over and over and over again. You're only hurting the people who work for this province.

The other very great concern that I have is that when these sectoral bargaining contracts are made, and I hope they are made before the August 1 deadline, I only hope that people understand that the income that they will be making, the concessions that they will be making, at the end of the three-year period can't be recaptured. What they've given up can't be recaptured overnight or we will be back in the same position that we are now. It's very, very important that when this plan is finally in place, either by way of legislation or by way of sectoral bargaining, we have some certainty and we know that when the three years end we will be on a stable foundation and we will not be back where we are.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'm glad to rise in the House on this very important occasion to address Bill 48, Bill 48 being, I think, probably one of the most draconian bills that has ever come before this Legislature; in fact a bill that I would say is going to have a disastrous effect on the relationship between trade unionists and the government for years and years to come.

If I could begin by looking at the present fiscal situation, because there's no question that the move to introduce such a piece of legislation is due directly to the very serious economic situation that we find ourselves in, I acknowledge the terrible effect of the recession and I acknowledge also that these are challenging times indeed for the government to have to face the many, many problems on every level, in every sector of the economy, and try to respond appropriately and well.

In my own riding of Victoria-Haliburton, I'd like to speak a little bit about the problems we are facing. We have nearly 30% unemployment in the county of Haliburton. We have nearly 20% unemployment in the county of Victoria. We have had significant problems. I look, for instance, in the agriculture area. We have had significant problems in our farms and in the rural areas and we have not seen any response on the part of this government.

We look in terms of the Minister of Agriculture and Food and we know that there has not been one bill that has passed this House from that ministry; not one bill. So we have a significant problem. Not only do we have a problem in terms of the economy, but we have a problem in terms of the fact that the government isn't responding adequately and well to that.

I look also in terms of the manufacturing concerns. I don't blame the government for that. I have to say obviously the free trade deal has been a disaster for our riding and we've lost many of our manufacturing concerns.

In terms of tourism, for instance, we have a very significant need for tourism, particularly in Haliburton county, which depends on tourism as its major sectorial provider of jobs. What do we find? We find that the government in a sense begins to gut the tourism ministry. We're not having the same kind of support for tourism that we used to have in this province. That's a great concern I have, particularly in the fact that in my own county we need more support by the government instead of less support.

I speak from these anecdotal situations to show you that in my own riding we have these significant problems. There's no question that the government facing these had to begin to direct itself along a course that was going to deal with these problems and deal also with the debt. There's no question that the leadership that the government has given in the last little while has been very much more concerned with debt reduction.

I'm not here to rail against the establishment of a social contract, whatever that concept may be. The presupposition that there is at this moment a need for the public service to reflect the restructuring of the economy is something I think every member in this House is willing to accept. As our economy has shrunk considerably over the last three years, we have continued to see a steady growth in the size and the cost of the public service. I don't believe that any sensible person would argue that such a growth is compatible with our present financial problems. No one would argue that these are the realities we're facing. However, where we get into significant debate is how we approach these vexing problems.

1630

One would have expected that in such an economic climate a social democratic government would have put a priority on the creation of jobs and a need to reaffirm its commitment to labour. This is of course not the route that was chosen by this government. Rather, the government has chosen dictatorial uses of power and a total rejection of social democratic principles. So much so is this the case that if we look philosophically or politically at the words that are used to justify the government's actions, if we look at the general direction that the government is taking, that government that we are speaking of, the New Democratic Party government, is really not a social democratic government. It's a government that has moved decidedly and decisively to the right.

Let me give you a "for instance," as we look at the article that was written by Mr Thomas Walkom of the *Toronto Star* dated Saturday, February 27, 1993. He

focuses in this article on two elements, the kind of philosophy we have and how the words that we use, the phrases that we use, in a sense, dictate the kinds of policies that we will come with. He says, for instance:

"In the end, Brian Mulroney's greatest achievement was one of language. Language defines, sets parameters. To describe a problem is to define its solution."

He talks about the Mulroney years and how successful the neo-conservative drive has been to establish the acceptable political rhetoric that is used today.

He goes on to say:

"Look at Ontario, home of a New Democratic Party government ostensibly opposed to virtually everything the federal Tories have done. Here too, the language of conservatism has won out.

"Like Mulroney, Premier Bob Rae talks of restraint, the importance of reducing debt, the inability of the government, with its quill-penned bureaucrats, to deliver.

"He, too, talks of the private sector as the engine of growth, the only mechanism for job creation. He, too, talks of forming partnerships with the business community, of making government live within its means, of radically reforming welfare programs to serve the needs of global competition.

"The importance of language is that it defines the limits for action. A government that is consumed with becoming more efficient, with reducing expenditures above all, has little time to think of ways in which it can act to reduce unemployment."

Then he goes on and makes comparisons between Mulroney and Mr Rae. In the end, he says Mr Mulroney "has spawned better salesmen now—New Brunswick Liberal Premier Frank McKenna, British Columbia's NDP Premier Mike Harcourt, Ontario's Rae. These NDP and Liberal conservatives try to sell a more genial form of Tory economics and do so in a more politically acceptable way.

"But at a fundamental level, they are Mulroney's heirs, his successors; their governments have implicitly accepted his view of the world.

"Bob Rae may say he disagrees with the Prime Minister's view of Canada. But he carries on the Mulroney legacy."

I heartily subscribe to the views put forth by Mr Tom Walkom in that article. In fact, if you look at the speeches that have been put forward in this place over the last period of time, they speak of neo-conservative doctrines. They are precisely the language that is used by the Tories. We have seen a significant change, if you will, on the part of the government. If I call into question today the fact that this is no social democratic government, it is because it has proven itself, in terms of its rhetoric at first and then later in terms of concrete action, that it is indeed a very conservative government.

Let's speak, if we can for a moment, about the idea of a social contract. I believe that the philosophy of the establishment of some kind of agreement between the public service unions, the transfer partners in the province—that is, the universities, hospitals, school boards, municipalities—and this provincial government in itself is a good idea. It's a good idea, of course, to bring people together to discuss things, to try to put in new agreements that could help the provincial government to achieve its goals.

Unfortunately, what we have is something that is very different. What we have in fact is a situation in which the government has not been willing to take seriously the needs and aspirations of its partners. We don't have partners here; we have the provincial government, by dictate, establishing what the result will be, what the goals will be, and forcing those goals and those end decisions. There are no negotiations here.

Difficult times demand difficult measures, according to this government, and so it is forced to turn on its former allies and to do that which is supposedly unthinkable, that is, to remove for three years the fundamental right of collective bargaining.

Yet is this surprising? In recent times, as indicated before, the Premier has begun to preach the gospel of debt reduction à la Mulroney. Despite the much-vaunted wage protection plan and the new Labour Relations Act, this government has moved decidedly to the right. It is seen particularly in the policies that have changed the New Democratic Party from being the heir of the CCF to one of the more opportunistic parties of the centre. How do we know that's the case? Well, we know it by listening to the rhetoric of debt reduction that we hear from the government.

Even more to the point, let's talk about the concrete policies that such a government proposes. We look at the auto insurance decision, Bill 164. We look at the introduction of casinos, Bill 8. We look at the agricultural policy through the eyes of Bill 75, which was the annexation bill for London. We look at the Sunday shopping bill. We look at the changes to the standing orders which were implemented by the government. We see in all of these things a total change in the direction and the beliefs and the structure of what this government says it has believed.

There are those who will say to you, "Well, again, these economic times are tough; therefore, what do you expect from this party?" I'll tell you what I expect. I expect people to do what they say they'll do. I expect people to put forth legislation which is going to reflect the philosophy that they have said they have agreed upon for years—philosophy, I might say, that I subscribe to.

I remember in the last election—I said this the other day in the House—I said there was a document called the Agenda for People. I remember when the opposition



used to throw this in the face of the government and say: "See all these promises that you didn't believe in? You've gone off and you've done your own thing." I've got to say that when it comes to the Agenda for People, I believed that document. I ran on that document. I put forward those things because I believed in them, and when I was elected, I didn't stop believing in those things. Well, they did, and you can see it when piece after piece of legislation is brought into this House which is nothing more than the total selling-out of the left-of-centre framework they have espoused for all these years.

So what's next? I'm looking at the Minister of Community and Social Services, because we hear next that there's going to be what they call "social assistance reform." Well, I've got news for you: When this government starts speaking about reform, I get nervous, because when it talks about reform, it doesn't talk about going forward; it talks about going backwards.

I spent 10 years working in areas around social policy and community groups, and I've got news: There's a lot of fear out there right now. There is group after group of people out there who are looking at this government and knowing, when it starts talking about social assistance reform, that this fits into a social charter, that this fits into the budget that's just been passed, that this fits into all of these full retreats it has made on these very important bills that it has put into this House.

So we have poverty groups and we have social groups and we have church groups and we have individuals who work with those who are at risk in our society and they're saying: "Not only do we not trust the government any more, but we fear more now than we have ever feared in our lives for the work that we're doing, because we used to support that party over there. We used to support those members and we thought they would protect us from the depredations of parties and individuals who did not have our interests at heart." So it is that with the introduction of Bill 48, the government has moved directly away from being a social democratic government and has not only adopted the rhetoric of the right, but has graduated into being a bona fide member of the club of the right.

1640

What can we say about Bill 48? Certainly, many things have been said by many people. I would say that it is a dangerous bill. I would say that it is precedent-setting. I would say that it is arbitrary.

It's interesting. I hear laughter in the House from certain members. It is laughable, but what's laughable is not the fact that this bill is this way, but that members don't even realize the import of what's happening in this place. They don't realize that what has been introduced is the most dangerous bill that has been introduced to this place since the War Measures Act, and they don't see it. They don't see it because when

they're in their caucus, it's: "Rah, rah. We're doing things together. This is for the betterment of Ontario. We don't have to think. We'll let the Premier do that. We don't have to work together to try to figure out the way ahead. We're just going to allow that we're going to go with this bill, no matter the cost."

That's fine. They can do that. In fact, they have done it. They've presented that bill in this House, but let me tell you, Mr Speaker, the cost will be great because you can't bring a dangerous bill like that into this place or a precedent-setting bill like this or an arbitrary bill like this without having a disastrous effect upon the relationships, both institutional and societal, in this province.

Let me say that the government arrogates to itself through Bill 48 the power through the Minister of Finance to nullify 8,000 collective agreements, to force one million workers to have their wages rolled back and then deny them due process. If they are laid off or unfairly treated by this process, they can't go to court to rectify the situation. This is nothing less than deceitful legislation.

But let me read you right from the act itself. Let me read this. This is right from the act.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think this is a very good speech and there should be a quorum to hear it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is there a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Victoria-Haliburton may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Drainville:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm glad to have that rest and the time to drink some water to prepare for the rest of the onslaught.

Let me say again that we're going to look at this legislation that's here in Bill 48. We talked about it being draconian. We talked about it being arbitrary. We talked about it being a very dangerous bill indeed. We read, for instance, in the non-bargaining unit section, non-bargaining unit plans, if you will—it says here under subsection 22(2):

"Actions of an employer taken in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan shall not be the subject of any proceeding brought by a person against the employer in relation to the terms and conditions of the person's employment as a non-bargaining unit employee of the employer or in relation to the person's release from employment as a non-bargaining unit employee of the employer."

What that means, in very simple terms, is no legal rights. This is what this supposedly social democratic government has put forward in the province of Ontario,

that workers should have no legal recourse, no due process to be able to defend them in this situation.

I go on and read the next subsection, (3), on grievance rights:

"A non-bargaining unit employee has no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act in respect of actions taken by his or her employer in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan." Again, no rights, no due process.

I turn now to section 33 of Bill 48, and this is part of part VII. Where no agreement is established, we read in subsection 33(4):

"Actions of an employer taken in accordance with this part shall not be the subject of any proceeding brought by a person against the employer in relation to the terms and conditions of the person's employment or in relation to the person's release from employment."

What do we have here? We have no due process. We have no justice. We have no opportunity for people to grieve. We have no opportunity for people to go to court over this. What we have is a total repudiation of the system that we have fought for 50 years to establish in terms of the relationship between the trade unions and the government.

Now, we hear from the government that this is necessary, that it's difficult times. Is it difficult times, so difficult in fact that we're willing to take away legal rights from people? Again, we look at the War Measures Act. Even in those days there were questions among some, and I might say the questions were raised with the members of the CCF in those days as to whether some of the draconian measures of the War Measures Act were acceptable to society at that time. But we have this bill which takes away the legal rights of people, and what do we hear from the government? What do we hear from this supposedly social democratic party? We hear nothing. "We must do this," they say.

Well, I differ with them. I do not accept it. I think this is a totally unacceptable piece of legislation. Not only should they go back to the drawing board; they should begin to look again at what the relationships truly are in this province regarding the transfer partners, regarding the unions and regarding the future of trying to build a prosperous province, because they haven't got it right at this point.

I'd like to draw some attention, if I might, in these remaining minutes to some of the other aspects of the legislation. First of all, I'd like to look at the purposes of the legislation. I must say that the longer I'm here in this place, the more I am totally incapable of accepting baffle-gab.

Now, you look at the purposes of this legislation—I mean Bill 48—and we read the purposes. The first purpose of this act is "To encourage employers, bargain-

ing agents and employees to achieve savings through agreements at the sectoral and local levels primarily through adjustments in compensation arrangements."

How are they going to do that? They're going to do it very simply. We're going to take away their rights, we're going to stop them from collective bargaining and we're going to force them, without the kind of negotiation and process that one would expect from a government which was socially democratic, into an agreement that they obviously do not want to go into at this point.

The second purpose of this act: "To maximize the preservation of public sector jobs and services through improvements in productivity, including the elimination of waste and inefficiency."

The elimination of waste and inefficiency in this case must be the elimination of jobs and the hopes of workers, the hopes that workers have had for many, many years, because in fact what they're doing is they're going to be forcing more and more workers to be in a situation where they're either going to be laid off or they're going to lose their earnings or they're going to be put into a situation that they have no control over.

1650

All I can say about that is, where did the 50 years go where the New Democratic Party supported the trade unions? Where is the tradition of this party standing up for workers? I don't hear it any more. I don't hear it because they've sold out the workers of this province and they've sold out many of the principles that they used to have as a party.

The third one: "To provide for expenditure reduction for a three-year period and to provide criteria and mechanisms for achieving the reductions." If we've heard anything in the debate in this House, we have surely heard from many people in this House that the chances of achieving the reduction they're speaking about in this bill are almost nil.

The last one is, "To provide for job security." I have to laugh. This is probably one of the funniest clauses in the act. Job security. They're talking about insurance; they're talking about the UIC; they're talking about topping that up. What they're not talking about is job security; they're talking about something quite different.

They use some phrases that I must say I object to. They talk about wage protection. How do they attempt wage protection? They attempt it by freezing workers' wages without negotiations. Wage protection—this is fraudulent. You are not protecting workers by freezing wages. You are not protecting workers by opening up contracts that you have negotiated and concluded in good faith. That's not what I call wage protection.

They also talk about facilitating negotiations. Well, as I've looked at the last eight weeks, there hasn't been a whole lot of facilitation with a gun held to the heads of



those who come to the meetings. All I can say is, that kind of facilitating of negotiations is not only unacceptable, it's untrue, it's not happening.

This legislation tramples on the rights of workers. It turns back the clock on all the legitimate gains that have been made by the trade union movement over the last 50 years. This bill is an affront to justice and equity and it flies in the face of basic rights and due process. If the government has any power, if the government has the power to arbitrarily freeze public service wages today, then it will have the power to freeze your wages tomorrow. For who will stop them? They're the government.

Another objection that I have to Bill 48, again refocusing, is this issue about collective bargaining. One of the major reasons why I cannot support the bill is because it effectively destroys the fundamental right of collective bargaining for the next three years. I certainly hope somebody takes this government to court about this particular right because I do not believe that what it is proposing is acceptable to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I'd like to see some people take them to court. It sets up a situation whereby in the period after 1996, when this government will probably be out of government at that time, there will be a total chaos of labour and government relationships.

When we look at the legislation, what we see is that not only does it lock up wages for the next three years, but also stops all merit increases, cost-of-living increases and pay increases due to a move up the seniority grid. This is what I call the kill-them-dead-in-their-tracks approach to bargaining or negotiating.

There is no possible way that individuals will be able to do any better in the situation. Everyone is going to be suffering and there are certain people who are going to be suffering more, and we're going to talk about that in a moment. The pain of such a policy will be felt by those who are entering the Ontario public service and those about to retire. Those are the two target areas where workers are going to be significantly disadvantaged by this legislation.

The government has requested that workers take 12 days of unpaid leave, one day a month. This is nothing more than a short-term layoff, 12 days, approximately a 5% pay cut for workers making \$30,000 and over. I remember many times when a particular local or a particular union was faced with a short-term layoff. I've got to tell you that in those days when there were short-term layoffs, this government, which supposedly supported the workers, went crazy in this House. I was sitting in the gallery back in the late 1970s when there were short-term layoffs proposed in this House by the Conservative government. I can't tell you what went on in this House in its repudiation of the Tory government policy. It was a total repudiation.

I was talking to a member the other day, and in years

past, if one of those other governments, a Liberal or Tory government, had introduced this, then the NDP would have stopped Parliament. They would have done everything in their power to stop this place from functioning because it was at one time one of the central focuses of their beliefs, of their philosophical allegiance. So it is that they continue to say they are a social democratic government, and they're not.

The other issue that I'd like to bring up before I sit down is the issue of special leave. Essential workers like police, firefighters and jail guards will be forced under the legislation to take their time off during regular vacation time and count it as unpaid leave. But as they are essential employees, they will be expected to take their paid days off at a later, mutually agreed-upon time, likely three years after the social contract is invoked, when it comes to an end. These costs will thereby be pushed on to future taxpayers: 36 paid days to be used after March 31, 1996, and that will mean a significant payout. There are thousands and thousands of those citizens in the province of Ontario.

In the last minute, what does this government say to the criticism it has heard from the opposition parties and from other people out there? They say: "We can introduce this legislation because we're the workers' party. We have their interests at heart." Please. I used to believe that. I don't believe it any more. "But we're the duly elected government," they say. "We can and must exercise power for the full number of citizens in this province. We're not just the supporters of certain special-interest groups." They should know by now that they have certain allegiances that should be important to them. If they're willing to sell out those allegiances, they're willing to sell out any allegiance.

My last point is the victimization that will happen in terms of the approach towards the public service unions that everyone wants to see sat upon these days. It's unacceptable by this government, and I would say that this piece of legislation should stop here, it should be killed, I would be glad to see that and I'll be voting against it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments?

**Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold):** I'm pleased to stand after the member's outstanding critique of Bill 48. He, as a member of the New Democratic Party and as a person who remains committed to the things he spoke about in his election campaign, to the things he as a member of that party joined so many others in working for, has, I tell you, a most credible voice in this Legislature.

I know there are a whole lot of people here who are advocates of this legislation. I understand that. That's why I think this debate is incredibly important and I think this debate should be a long-standing, far-reaching debate, so that all of those views are expressed here in this assembly.



There are people who don't have high regard for free collective bargaining. I know that too. I tell you that in the election of 1990 I don't think very many of those people voted for me. The people who did vote for me knew where I stood when it came to the rights of working women and men, be they public sector or private sector. People who did vote for me knew where I stood when it came to the sanctity of a freely negotiated contract and the fact that New Democrats and CCFers before them are committed to protecting that collective bargaining process. I know that not everybody in my community agrees with my position on Bill 48. I understand that, and that's as it should be.

But I ran for election to this Parliament expressing, adopting and trying to articulate sets of principles. I think it's important and I think I owe it to the people in Welland-Thorold, who voted for me and who agreed with those principles, to make sure that those principles are reflected in how I vote on this and other legislation here in this Legislative Assembly. I applaud the member for his courage, for his straightforwardness and for his most valuable contribution to this very important debate for the future of this province and the working women and men of this province.

1700

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** It's a pleasure to rise and congratulate the member for Victoria-Haliburton too. He at least has principles. I notice that some of the more high-profile people like the member for Perth is not here, nor is the member for Wentworth East. The member for Welland-Thorold just spoke to us, but I don't really know what he said. He really didn't speak out, as did the member for Victoria-Haliburton.

It appears as though the member for Victoria-Haliburton, unlike many of the members in the House, has read the act and has seen that this is a diabolical act that was probably drafted by Stalin's agents. It has absolutely no opportunities for people to say anything. It gives dictatorial powers to the Minister of Finance. That, to me, is dangerous in any democratic society. If the people over there who consider themselves to be social democrats would read the bill, perhaps they would see just how arbitrary and dictatorial this is. In fact, it not only gives dictatorial powers to him; it gives the right for him to subdelegate to somebody else dictatorial powers. Surely to heaven the people who vote in parliaments and free countries vote for the right to at least be heard.

This act, in fact, eliminates the Statutory Powers and Procedures Act. For the people who are viewing this telecast, that is a specific statute that ensures that people have the right to be heard. In fact, that has been excluded from this act. I'm sure the member for Welland-Thorold understands that as a lawyer. Yet these people are prepared to sit over there on their hands and

allow the Minister of Finance to bring in a draconian piece of legislation like this piece of junk and usurp the rights of the people of this province. I think it's absolutely outrageous.

I would like to know where the member for Perth is. She was the one in the press report who espoused that she was against this. Why isn't she speaking out against it? I applaud the member for Victoria-Haliburton. You've at least got the guts and your principles. The rest of them have abandoned their principles since they got elected.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We all, looking at the empty benches across the way, could list numbers of people who are absent, and it's completely out of order for a member to get up and talk about—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Please take your chair. The member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** Quickly, as a point, the member for Perth was here and she did actually oppose the legislation. I'll wait until the clock starts because I don't want any more than two minutes.

You know what, Mr Speaker? I'd like to ask the question or at least put this thought forward. I, myself, believe in collective agreements. I have negotiated collective agreements for unions and I know the member from Durham dump is probably a little surprised about that, but the fact is that I do believe in collective agreements. When there were Metropolitan Toronto council meetings that voted to put the TTC back to work—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** If you'd listen up for a minute. When there were council meetings to vote to ask the Legislature to legislate TTC workers back to work, I opposed it. I opposed them because I believe in collective bargaining and I believe in collective agreements. I believe when you sign a contract you have to live up to that contract. I fundamentally, wholeheartedly believe in that. That may be where the political spectrum meets someplace around the corner, I'm not sure. But I think as a government you have certain responsibilities to your employees.

I don't say you shouldn't be reducing government. Quite honestly, I'm completely opposite. I believe in reducing government. I remember my first few months here. I stood up and I said, "We have way too many employees in this province," and there was snickering on that side. Even from the Liberal side they would yell out, "Well, where?" But we did have too many. What's surprising to me and I think what's refreshing is that there is some candour on that side of the House—enough—that there are a handful of members who will stand up and at least defend what they used to



believe in. Because I will tell you, Mr Speaker, it does get discouraging in the first couple of years, watching the backflips and waffling and flip-flops that this government has taken. There wasn't a single member who had the guts to stand up and say, "We were wrong."

I think Mr Drainville deserves a round of applause, not just from the citizens of Ontario or his constituents, but from the memories and the conscience of this party that he once belonged to. I think he deserves it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further questions or comments? If not, the member for Victoria-Haliburton, you have two minutes. Oh, one more? Nobody stood up. I'm sorry. I apologize, the member for Oriole. I thought you wanted to address the floor. I apologize.

**Mrs Caplan:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I'd like to comment on the member for Victoria-Haliburton's very articulate response to Bill 48. He used words like "arbitrary," "precedent-setting," "draconian," "unworkable," and I agree with the comments he made in that context of the legislation. He also expressed not only his own principles but his disappointment.

We know that he left the NDP caucus, crossed the floor and is sitting as an independent member of this House. I must admit this is one of the first times that I've had the opportunity to listen to him speak on an issue other than the one which provoked his leaving that caucus. I would say to him, as I listen to him today, that I know the people of this province will find it a significant and refreshing debate to hear from someone who stands in the House and is very, very clear about his own principles and his own values, especially someone who had, under the disciplines of the NDP caucus, been stifled for so long.

I know that his concerns about this legislation are not partisan. As I say, as I look at this legislation, I share the concerns that have been raised and I say to the people of this province that we are looking at legislation which is unworkable. We've learned nothing from past history. It destroys and interferes with collective bargaining in a way which is unprecedented in this province and it sets a dangerous precedent for the future.

The question I would ask the member for Victoria-Haliburton, given his experience, is why he thinks that a social democratic government, Bob Rae's government, would have chosen this route when there were so many better ways it could have dealt with the need to restrain. There is a need to take back that which they gave which they couldn't afford to give.

**Mr Drainville:** I'll just very quickly say to the member for Oriole, the reason why the government has done that is because it's not a social democratic government. That would be my response.

I want to say though, in the few minutes' time that are remaining, as regards the whole issue of the victim-

ization of the public service, I believe the government is playing a very, very cynically political move. I believe they realize there are an awful lot of people in our society today who are saying that the public service of Ontario is too big, that there are too many workers, that they receive too much money. They have become a very easy target. In fact, I believe they are the target very much of this legislation. The government believes that by using them as a bogeyman, it's going to be able to push ahead its particular brand of economics at this point in time and that the unions are going to increasingly look bad because they're trying to defend themselves from this kind of legislation, which is totally unacceptable.

I want to underline this for the government members: What we have in fact is a government, which ostensibly has claimed that it is the government that supports workers, actually in this legislation taking a swipe and a strike against workers the likes of which we have not seen for years in this province. I believe the cynical politics of using the public service unions and the public service employees are ultimately going to backfire, and it will not be to the benefit of this government here.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate today in the debate on Bill 48, which is called, and I'd like to read the name of the act to the Legislative Assembly, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program.

That's the long title. It's also a tradition in this province for there to be a short title, and so we've been calling this the social contract legislation. I know that there are many who are calling it the soc-con, the acronym often used to shorten titles even further. Unfortunately, soc-con is being used to portray the sock it to them and con them about what this really is.

1710

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think there should be a quorum.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex D. McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is present.

**Mrs Caplan:** As I was saying, this is a piece of legislation which I think the people of the province of Ontario are just beginning to understand the implications of. I'm not even sure that Bob Rae and his government really fully understand the implications of this legislation.

I'd like to spend my time, if I can, trying to give my perspective on this, because I'm very concerned that

what this legislation is going to do is increase public scepticism, increase public cynicism and create a climate where people are going to have their anxiety, their alienation and their fear increased just at a time when what is really needed in this province is stability, calm and confidence. This legislation will not achieve that.

These are difficult economic times in the province of Ontario. The residents in the constituency of Oriole, the people whom I have the honour to serve, are very concerned. They are worried about their own jobs. They're worried about the opportunities for their children, many of whom are unemployed, many of whom do not have opportunities to work this summer, many of whom are worried about whether they will be able to continue to have their education this coming fall. They're waiting to see whether they will be admitted into community colleges and universities.

The situation is one which is serious in the province of Ontario. People are worried about the size of the NDP deficit and the growing debt in this province. They should be worried, because these are serious and difficult economic times.

Having said that, people want to work, they want a climate of confidence that will create jobs. When we look at this legislation, we know that while everybody in this province understands the need for belt tightening, understands the need for restraint, they are also beginning to understand that part of the reason we are in this mess is because of the terrible decisions, particularly the decision to increase wages at the beginning of the recession, when this government took office in the fall of 1990.

They raised the spending plan at that point in time from a projected 6.8% in September 1990—that's what the spending plan was—to 14.7% by the end of March of that year. March 31 saw the spending increase in the province of Ontario by 14.7%. The second year of the NDP, the next full year, we saw an increase in spending of 12%.

If you look at where that money went, that money went primarily in increased wages to the public sector and the broader public sector.

Over the course of that time, I stood in this House—the record is in Hansard—and I said, "Don't do it. You're making a mistake. You're raising wages of the people who have jobs as opposed to creating a climate where more people will be able to work."

We understand that there were also increases in social assistance payments because at that time people were losing their jobs, but the structural deficit problem that took us from a fully balanced budget in 1989-90 and a balanced operating budget, even at the end of 1991—

**Hon Mr Wildman:** That's creative bookkeeping.

**Mrs Caplan:** The minister is sitting opposite, and I

will say to him that the Provincial Auditor has attested to the fact that there was a fully balanced budget in this province for the fiscal year 1989-90. He can laugh, he can jeer, but those are the facts.

The facts are also that at the end of 1991, at the end of the six months following the assumption of power by the NDP government, we had a \$3-billion deficit but we still had a fully balanced operating budget. Try as they would to increase the spending in those six months, they still could not get us into a deficit position, which included the capital budget, until the following fiscal year, when we saw a structural deficit projected of \$9.7 billion, which turned out to be \$10.7 billion in that year.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Come on Elinor, the truth shall set you free.

*Interjections.*

**Mrs Caplan:** They're hooting, they're hollering, but this is the truth. I am giving you the facts.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs Caplan:** They were in your budget documents of this year and of last year.

**Hon Mike Farnan (Minister without Portfolio in Education and Training):** Come on. Get back to your job.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Cambridge.

**Mrs Caplan:** Mr Speaker, I'm wasting my time. They don't want to understand. I know I've had this debate in this House before—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Farnan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Oriole on several occasions has referred to a previous speaker to tell the truth. In fact, she called their comments a load of crap. I would say to the honourable member, please do as you say.

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm giving you the facts.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The member for Sarnia. Order. The member for Oriole.

**Mrs Caplan:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The concern I have when the member rises on his point of order is that he obviously hasn't read his own budget document. The NDP budget document says exactly what I just said. Those are the facts. It is absolutely truthful and honest.

**Hon Mr Farnan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: To impute that an honourable member of the House, a member of the government has not read a government document is certainly—

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is not a point of order. The member for Oriole has the floor.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Get your act together. You're just being provocative.



**Mrs Caplan:** I am being provocative, Mr Speaker. Obviously, they're provoked by the truth, because what they're trying to do in this debate is to try to tell people that the facts are different than what they are. I will say to the member for Cambridge—

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The member for Cambridge, I'd like to warn you that I find your language insulting, and I ask you to refrain from using that type of language.

**Hon Mr Farnan:** Mr Speaker—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I ask you to refrain from using that type of language. It's conducive to a bad debate; it's unbecoming of a member. I'm just telling you this.

1720

**Mrs Caplan:** The reason I put these facts on the table is not to be provocative but in fact to engage in this debate in a framework so that people who are watching this debate will understand. They will understand that what the NDP government inherited was a triple A credit rating and they will understand that the decisions that were made by Bob Rae and Treasurer Laughren and the government of Ontario in the fall of 1990 have contributed greatly.

In fact the total spending plan of \$43 billion is exactly \$10 billion less than what the spending plan is for this year. That is also the projected deficit of this province. What this NDP government is trying to do, and rightly so, is take back from the workers in the broader public sector what it allowed to be given in the way of wage increases that were clearly unaffordable.

I would point out that in the summer of 1990 we were talking about restraint; I have been talking about restraint in this House ever since. I know it is very important that the province of Ontario be on a sound financial footing. I know it is extremely important that we be fiscally responsible. I believe it is extremely important that we deal with deficit and that we deal with debt.

Having said that, I want you to know that in the years that I've had the opportunity to stand in this House and speak on numerous pieces of legislation and on numerous initiatives, both of the government that I served and during this time in opposition, on numerous occasions I am on the record as having said I support free collective bargaining, and I do.

This legislation, Bill 48, interferes with the collective bargaining process in a way which is unheard of and unprecedented in this province. I stood in this House and I resisted attempts, when I was Minister of Health, when the Premier, Bob Rae, and his now members of his cabinet called for the opening of contracts, and I said—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The member for Guelph, if you have any comments, wait after she is through with her speech. The member for Oriole, make sure you address the Chair.

**Mrs Caplan:** I said then and I repeat now that broad-brush solutions, simplistic solutions to complex problems simply do not work. From the point at which Bob Rae announced his social contract negotiations, I have been concerned. I have been concerned because the government of Ontario is not the employer of 950,000 people; the government of Ontario is the employer of 90,000 people. The government of Ontario has a partnership relationship with the colleges, municipalities, hospitals and school boards who employ the over 800,000 people who are in the broader public sector.

There are over 9,000 collective agreements that have been negotiated between employers and employees in this province, and this legislation and the social contract negotiations that began put the province in the position of employer of over one million people and potentially—and I believe that's one of the serious flaws of this legislation—handcuffs those employers in their ability to manage and to govern this province, changes for ever the employer and employee relationships and interferes with the ability of employers and employees to find solutions to local problems.

From my own personal experience, I know that hospitals, municipalities, and I believe as well colleges and universities, can find the solutions, can find the ways to restrain wages—yes, use the word—roll back those wages, restrain the labour costs, but they will do it differently in each location. Central planning, centralized everything, does not work. Those, Mr Speaker, were the attempted solutions of decades gone by and I would say to you that the Premier, Bob Rae, and his government would do well to learn from history.

I believe we should have legislation, because time has been running out, but what the legislation should do is legislate the opening of those contracts, give the transfer partners their targeted responses and then allow them, along with their own employees, to freely and collectively negotiate how that's going to happen. Do you know what that would be called? That would be called concession bargaining, and that's what this is really about. Concession bargaining is what should be occurring in this province.

To have the provincial government do anything other than say to its own employees, the 90,000—what I think they should do is say to the management class, to those who are excluded: "This is how we are going to deal with you, our employees. This is how we are going to implement the wage rollback." If the government wanted to say to those employees: "We are going to roll back or have the equivalent in time off. We are going to freeze wages for three years. We are going to,

through attrition, find additional savings. Further, we want you to work with us to find ways of delivering programs and services in more cost-effective and cost-efficient ways, and we will have a merit approach, a pay-for-productivity approach," I think those employees would respond.

I also believe that employees across this province, both in the Ontario public service who directly work for the provincial government and those who work in the broader public sector, don't want to see their neighbours laid off. They want to keep jobs and save jobs wherever possible. They don't want to see their neighbours out of work, and they could find those solutions.

If Bob Rae and his Chairman of Management Board and his Treasurer and his chairman of the treasury board had put their heads together and said, "Let's listen to Lyn McLeod. Let's listen to the alternative that says, 'Develop a framework agreement for our own employees,'" and then said to OPSEU and to the other small unions that we negotiate with within the Ontario public service, the 90,000 employees in total, "Let's deal with those unions and say, 'This is what we're doing with our employees who are in the excluded class and this is what we would like to negotiate with you,'" I believe it would have been possible to come up with a sensible, workable plan. Then that plan could have been a model for other employers in the broader public sector.

But the approach this government has taken says, "We don't trust you," to the employers and municipalities. "We don't trust you," they say to the employers, the universities and the colleges and the school boards and the hospitals. I say that is a shame, because what is needed in this province if we are going to solve the problems that are facing us is for people to work together.

As I said, I believe that public sector workers and broader public sector employees and employers all understand the need today to address the financial difficulties the province finds itself in, but I believe and I think they know that there are ways to find these savings without massive cuts in services and without massive layoffs. I believe that is achievable, even if it means, and it may well mean, that everybody will take a little bit less. I think they're willing to negotiate it.

1730

But what they're really angry about is that this legislation, Bill 48, sets up a bureaucratic, intrusionary process. First you have to have a sector agreement. Then you have to have individually collectively negotiated agreements, have it all done by August 1 or maybe until the 10th. They have to be submitted to the ministers for approval.

That isn't going to work, and, further, it rips up the collective agreements that are out there and it puts the province in the position of commander and controller.

In this day of trying to do things in a better and a more progressive way, command and control doesn't work. We learned that over the years, and I sincerely wish that this government had realized that before it tabled Bill 48.

Parliamentary tradition is all about precedent, so I'd like to speak for a minute about the precedents that are established in this legislation which I believe are very dangerous.

The precedents in this legislation take away the rights of workers to grieve and to appeal. That's in this legislation. It takes those rights away. It takes away the rights of employers to negotiate with their own employees. This legislation says, "From now on you have to have the approval of the Finance minister for your collective agreements." That is unbelievable, and it will change for ever the way this province is governed.

One of the major concerns I have about this legislation and the reason that I will not be supporting it—and I've stated very clearly that I agree that we must restrain the spending of this provincial government. They must achieve their \$2-billion target for wage reduction in the broader public sector. I agree with that. But what they're doing is not that at all.

What they are doing is pushing those costs into the future. My estimate is that some \$3 billion will be pushed three years down the road. That is fiscally irresponsible, it is deceptive and it is saying to the workers of this province that this is not only short-term pain; this is going to be long-term pain, because we're going to have to go through this anguish and anxiety all over again if the expectation is that at the end of the three years they're going to get it all back like that.

This legislation does not achieve the savings that the provincial government has said it wants, and, further, I believe that it sets a precedent on how you go about negotiating and working with your partners in the broader public sector that, in the hands of right-wing Conservative governments, could—and I say "could" because I'm looking into the future now—be used in a way which nobody today is even contemplating. So I'm concerned not only about the precedent, but also about what this will mean in the future.

Certainly when I hear the minister say, "Oh, well, we're just giving ourselves this power but we're never going to use it," I will say to them, you're not going to be the government for ever. We don't know who the next government is going to be. I certainly don't take for granted that I'm going to be a member of the next government. I don't think anybody on this side of the House can predict the future, and I certainly would not be one to predict. I can't look 10 years down the road.

But I know that if you have legislation on the books, if the precedents in this House strip away the rights of



individuals to grieve, strip away the rights of employers to manage and to govern—those who are duly elected in this province, I will remind you, in school boards and municipalities—strip away the rights of workers and employers to collectively bargain, then you'll look back on this debate and you'll say, "She told us so."

I say to you, I will take no pleasure in that. I will take no pleasure in being proven right. I hope that this legislation is defeated, because it will set a precedent in this province that we will look back on and say, "This should never have happened." It is impossible to turn the clock back. That's what a precedent is. It is impossible to turn the clock back and go back to yesterday.

There is no way that we can go back to that summer campaign of 1990. There is no way that we can go back to the fall and to decisions that were made by Bob Rae in 1990 and 1991 and 1992. Those days are gone. We must deal with the reality today. This draconian piece of social contract legislation, even if it is repealed in the future, will have made its mark on the province of Ontario in such a negative way that the future will be for ever altered because of it.

So my message to the members of the government and to the members of their caucus is, read this legislation very carefully. Consider what the implications are and then imagine what these powers will do potentially in the future as well as today.

There's another piece of legislation that this government has tabled; the health expenditure control plan. I don't know if I'll have the opportunity to speak to it at length, but I have the same concerns: the draconian powers that it gives the Minister of Health to interfere in the relationship between the patient and the doctor. For the Minister of Health to interfere in clinical decision-making runs totally contrary to everything that I believe in.

Day after day, as I stood in this House and answered questions from members of the opposition about the state of our health system through the years 1987 to 1990, on many, many occasions, I said to them, "Those are clinical decisions; ministers of Health, provincial governments, bureaucrats do not interfere with clinical decisions." If you are dissatisfied, there are ways of making recourse or gathering information, but for a minister to have those powers is wrong.

For a Minister of Finance to have the powers that Bill 48 gives to the Minister of Finance is wrong. I would not have wanted those powers as Minister of Health. I would not want these powers. As Finance minister, as Premier, as Minister of Economic Development, as Minister of Industry and Trade, as Minister of Municipal Affairs or Colleges and Universities or Minister of Education, I would not want those powers, and I don't want these ministers or any future ministers to have those powers.

But if you give them these powers, they will never be taken away, because that's what precedent and tradition are all about. If the New Democratic Party, a labour-socialist government, gives itself these kinds of centralized, intrusionary powers, they will for ever be on the books, because no government will make that a priority to change that, because there are days when you say, "Gee, I wish I had that power." I can tell, you don't want government to have those powers.

1740

I believe it is possible to reduce the broader public sector payroll by \$2 billion. I believe it must be done and I believe there are ways of achieving that and I've just told you how. I hope they will act quickly to withdraw this legislation and allow for local employers and employees to find those solutions.

Once you give them the transfer payment number, once you open their collective agreements, they will find those solutions. Have confidence and trust in them, because only with that kind of relationship in the province of Ontario will true partnership ever be possible. You're using the language, you're saying the words, but you're contaminating the language and the words have a very different meaning.

As I conclude my part in today's debate, I want to remind the government that what Ontario needs is stability and security; confidence so that jobs can be created and people will work. Bill 48 should be withdrawn.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** I'm very pleased to be able to respond to the member for Oriole. I realize what the member is saying is that, for once, a New Democratic government has responded and changed gears halfway through its mandate and they can't understand that a government can adapt with the times, can change with the times.

But it's nothing new with what this government is doing, creating partnerships and also saying to the public sector unions and to every other union: "We're willing to negotiate, and for our part in the \$2-billion cuts, our negotiations are important in that in return for the negotiations and for helping us, we're saying: 'You have a greater part in running this government. You have a greater part in the decision-making of the departments and the agencies that you are working in.'"

Yes, there's bitter criticism from our old union friends, but that's not surprising. In fact, if the unions did not fight for their membership I'd be ashamed of them, and I'm not ashamed of them because they've done their job well and they've done it very well. For my part, as a previous member of a union, I'm saying thank God for the union movement because they didn't let their membership down.

What they have done, and where the member cannot

understand this, is that not only have they come to us and said, "We don't agree with it," but we've worked it out together at our provincial council meetings and we've said to each other, "Yes, we can work together and we're willing to go to the table because what we see as an alternative is something a lot worse than what you're offering us."

If everyone remembers what happened in Britain after the so-called social contract failed in Britain, what did they get? Thatcherism. What happened in the United States after the union movement stopped giving money to the Democrats? They got Reaganism. Ask the air traffic controllers how they were negotiated out of a job. It was swift. It was fast.

That's what we are doing: We are creating more partnerships with the labour movement rather than destroying them.

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I'd like to first of all commend the member for Oriole on her very knowledgeable and well-given speech. As usual, she always speaks very clearly and explains things very, very well.

I think she hit it on the nose when she said that people are very worried. People are extremely distressed. They really feel the lack of stability and feel that, really, there's no one in this government who is in control. There's nothing they really can hang on to. There is an agitation and nervousness when you meet people. In the riding, people come up to me and they really don't want to talk about the state of the government, but it's almost like they can't help themselves.

The general public and our party, though, all realize that restraint is necessary. We have been spending too much and we need to rein in and control, especially in these economically depressed times. But people are afraid that this government's social contract is not the answer, that it is not going to solve the problems, that at the end of the day, the deficit reductions are not going to be achieved.

**Municipal leaders—**I was just speaking to some of them this morning—really do not know how they are going to meet these targets and yet provide the essential services. I had one municipal leader say: "We're just going to have to pull the road budget. We cannot really do what we had intended to do, and so we'll just make shift, do a few repairs here and there and then have to pay 10 times as much down the road to really fix it up."

I commend the member again for trying to explain how things really are.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** The member opposite speaks of uncertainty and instability. To some degree, there is a great deal of truth in what she says. There is instability, there is uncertainty caused by the negotiations, the slowness of the process, but I would contrast that with the slash-and-burn techniques

that have been used in other provinces.

I would suggest the province of Newfoundland, which as I recall has a Liberal government. I would compare it to the province of New Brunswick, which as I recall has a Liberal government, where the workers went on a general strike. I would compare it to Prince Edward Island, which recently did the same thing with its public sector, and Quebec, which has done the same thing. We're talking about slash and burn.

While the slash-and-burn techniques may be effective, while they may create certainty—you know you're unemployed—we would like to attempt something which deals sensitively with some very, very difficult issues, like low-income cutoff, like job security, like retraining for public sector workers, like the ability of workers to be assured of the next available job in their area, even if not with their own immediate employer.

These are difficult issues. All of these issues, such as the collective agreement, are difficult things for us as social democrats. There are things we have taken some time to wrestle with. But the alternative, the slash-and-burn alternative, the job losses for the most vulnerable in our community, the job losses and the income reductions that we have seen through the federal Liberal government, with the Anti-Inflation Board, with the pay cuts—we had wage and price controls that controlled only wages.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Brampton South, you have two minutes. Do you want to comment?

**Mr Callahan:** I find it interesting when the members opposite and the government talk about this legislation. I wonder if they've read it, because, quite clearly, to say, "All right, a Liberal government in some other province enacted it, so we'll enact it"—I would challenge you to look at the legislation that was enacted in another province. You'll find that it's not as draconian as this.

I suggest you read this bill. I suggest all members of the New Democratic Party read the bill, because this bill is the equivalent of a dictatorial statement, power being placed in the hands of one person. Why on earth do we have 130 members in this Legislature if the power that's going to have an impact on the lives of a significant number of people in this province is being handled by one person? I suggest to you, I challenge you, read the bill. You will see that's exactly the situation. It is not a bill with any right of appeal. The former Attorney General would know that if he's read the bill, and I hope he has, because that's what's happening.

All I say to you is that I don't know how people in a democratically elected Legislature can possibly support this bill in its present form. It has absolutely no protection for the rights of anyone. By the government



countenancing it, it is just divesting itself of all the principles it believes in.

I always thought "democrat" meant you cared about the people. What you're doing is allowing the government to push through this bill, and you're all going to stand there probably and vote, joined at the hip, without even knowing what's in the bill.

I urge you, in the final analysis, to read the bill. If you can't read it, have somebody read it for you, have it interpreted for you, have a précis done of it. But for God's sakes, before you vote on this bill, understand what it's about. It is the most diabolical bill that's ever been presented to any democratic Legislature.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Oriole, you have two minutes.

**Mrs Caplan:** On May 5 I presented the Chair of Management Board and the government of Ontario with a very real alternative. I said to him, and I quote, "We believe a better approach would have been to negotiate in good faith with your own employees, the 90,000 OPS workers, and use that agreement as a model to be followed for the broader public sector employers in the hospitals," municipalities, school boards, colleges and universities.

I must admit at the beginning of these social contract negotiations, I believed the government had a framework deal with the labour leaders in this province. I couldn't imagine a government embarking on negoti-

ations to override 9,000 collective agreements with almost a million employees, more than 800,000 of whom did not work for it directly, without having had an indication that it would have had a deal. For a while I thought this was all part of the ritual dance of collective bargaining as known by the NDP and the NDP government.

I want to stand in this House and say that I was wrong. They obviously did not know what they were doing when they entered this, and Bill 48 is a product of frustration. It is time to end the chaos. Command and control does not work. It has never worked, it never will work. There is a better alternative but only if you act quickly. We are halfway through the fiscal year. The municipalities, the school boards, the hospitals, the universities and the colleges must know what their transfer payments are going to be and they must be allowed to work with their own employees to solve those problems.

Do not tie their hands. Direct them and tell them that we don't want job losses and layoffs as a result. They know that, the workers know that, but do not impose your will on them and for heaven's sake, do not take those kinds of powers unto yourself. You will live to regret this day.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Your time has expired.

*Report continues in volume B*







# CONTENTS

Tuesday 22 June 1993

<b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b>		<b>International trade</b>		<b>Registrar general</b>	
<b>Tobacco taxes</b>		Mr Abel . . . . .	1761	Mr Cleary . . . . .	1767
Mr Cleary . . . . .	1747	Ms Lankin . . . . .	1761		
<b>Highway safety</b>		<b>Retail sales tax</b>		<b>SECOND READINGS</b>	
Mrs Witmer . . . . .	1747	Mr McGuinty . . . . .	1762	<b>Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48</b>	
<b>César Chavez</b>		Mr Laughren . . . . .	1762	Mr Harnick . . . . .	1768, 1772
Mr Frankford . . . . .	1747	<b>Conservation authorities</b>		Mrs Caplan . . . . .	1772, 1779, 1785
<b>Social contract</b>		Mr Jordan . . . . .	1763	Mr McLean . . . . .	1772
Mrs Caplan . . . . .	1747	Mr Laughren . . . . .	1763	Mr Drainville . . . . .	1773
<b>Vehicle licensing offices</b>		<b>Small business</b>		Mr Kormos . . . . .	1777
Mr Turnbull . . . . .	1748	Mr Marchese . . . . .	1763	Mr Callahan . . . . .	1778, 1784
<b>Political mailing</b>		Ms Lankin . . . . .	1763	Mr Stockwell . . . . .	1778
Mr Fletcher . . . . .	1748			Mr Fletcher . . . . .	1783
<b>Alzheimer respite companion</b>				Mrs Fawcett . . . . .	1784
<b>program</b>				Mr White . . . . .	1784
Mr Bradley . . . . .	1748	<b>PETITIONS</b>			
<b>Transfer payments to municipalities</b>		<b>Special education</b>		<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
Mr McLean . . . . .	1749	Mr O'Neil . . . . .	1764	<b>Correction</b>	
<b>Deaf-Blind Awareness Week</b>		Mr Villeneuve . . . . .	1765	Mr Mills . . . . .	1749
Mr Malkowski . . . . .	1749	<b>Gambling</b>		<b>Bud Germa</b>	
		Mr McLean . . . . .	1764	Mr Rae . . . . .	1749
		Mr Waters . . . . .	1765	Mr Bradley . . . . .	1750
		Mr Drainville . . . . .	1765	Mr Sterling . . . . .	1750
		Mr Klopp . . . . .	1767	<b>Smirle Forsyth</b>	
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>		<b>International trade</b>		Mr Philip . . . . .	1751
<b>Social contract</b>		Mr White . . . . .	1764	Mr Cordiano . . . . .	1752
Mrs McLeod . . . . .	1754	<b>Automobile insurance</b>		Mr Cousens . . . . .	1752
Mr Rae . . . . .	1754, 1757	Mr Kwinter . . . . .	1764	Mr Callahan . . . . .	1753
Mr Harris . . . . .	1757	Mrs Witmer . . . . .	1766	Mr Poirier . . . . .	1753
Mr Phillips . . . . .	1759	Mr Phillips . . . . .	1766	Mr Morin . . . . .	1753
Mr Laughren . . . . .	1759	<b>GO bus service</b>		Mr Rae . . . . .	1754
<b>Tax and fee increases</b>		Mr Tilson . . . . .	1765	The Speaker . . . . .	1754
Mrs McLeod . . . . .	1756	<b>Closure of agricultural college</b>		<b>Visitor</b>	
Mr Laughren . . . . .	1756	Mr Ramsay . . . . .	1765	The Speaker . . . . .	1764
<b>Gambling</b>		<b>Waste disposal</b>		<b>Report, standing committee on</b>	
Mr Harris . . . . .	1758	Mr Hansen . . . . .	1766	<b>finance and economic affairs</b>	
Ms Churley . . . . .	1758	<b>Water quality</b>		The Speaker . . . . .	1767
<b>Interprovincial trade</b>		Mrs MacKinnon . . . . .	1766		
Mr Runciman . . . . .	1760				
Mr Rae . . . . .	1760				

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 22 juin 1993

<b>PÉTITIONS</b>	
<b>Contrat social</b>	
M. Poirier . . . . .	1766



CA2011  
8/1  
-128

No. 36B



Document  
Publication

N° 36B

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 22 June 1993**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Mardi 22 juin 1993**

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Tuesday 22 June 1993

*Report continued from volume A.*

1750

## SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

## LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Continuation of debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry.

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** And East Grenville. I was just reminiscing a bit today. It's going to be 10 years in December that I was elected to this Legislature and had the opportunity of sitting in government, sitting in opposition and sitting where we are now as a member of the third party. As a matter of fact, the government in place now has been in all of those positions during those 10 years.

Interestingly, I recall the Legislature having been recalled to settle some TTC strikes and a number of others, and when this government sat as an opposition party, it could not have done enough to protect its friends within the labour movement. I admired them for it because it was a doctrine, it was a dogma and they followed it to the T. You respect people who do that.

However, something happened. Those were the days when Big Brother giveth. We are now entering the time where Big Brother taketh away. It's a rather strange phenomenon, that the Big Brother would be led by Premier Bob Rae. He is the Big Brother, along with his brothers in that party, and if indeed he would have laid the cards on the table when negotiations occurred—

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** What about sisters?

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Brothers and sisters.

**Mr Villeneuve:** Brothers and sisters, of course. I apologize. The two founding genders very much exist and coexist and thank God for that.

However, back to the subject at hand. When this party—

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** You got yourself out of that one smoothly.

**Mr White:** He is smooth.

**Mr Villeneuve:** I've been here for 10 years.

We go back to the philosophy of the governing party. There's only about four members left of that original group and of course they are the four power brokers on the front benches from the time when I was first elected here. They still look the same; they've aged a bit, but their philosophy has totally turned around, completely. I'm going to cite you a few examples.

Whenever we went back and recalled the Legislature—I remember even the Liberal Party was prevented from presenting a budget. They had to table it. These people knew every little trick in the book to make this Legislature work to their satisfaction, their needs and their desires, and I, as a member who was newly elected, was admiring them for—it's strange; they're in opposition and yet seem to be able to get their agenda on the front burner, and I give them credit for that. However, their agenda now is somehow off the beaten path, the path that has traditionally been the New Democratic Party line.

I would like for them to explain some of the initiatives that were taken in this deal, for example, to have said to their so-called friends and partners, "We will sit at the Royal York from the beginning of April till whenever it has to be, and you will negotiate with us." Well, their partners were at the table and negotiating for more than two months, well into June, \$5,000 a day, and nothing was happening.

Their partners did not know what the alternative solution was. If they would have had the alternative solution, ie, the draconian bill that has been brought in—and I think this bill can be amended to make it at least palatable; if not democratic, at least palatable—the partners may well have sat down and said, "If this is the alternative to the negotiations, we better take this very seriously."

However, they did not in their wildest nightmares think that Premier Bob Rae could do that to them, and this is what they're having to accept, the reality of political life when you reach the levers of power. Big Brother was always there to give. Big Brother now is taking away.

I have some suggestions. A number of people phoned me up on the weekend, and I'll just tell you how serious these things are. Two OPP officers phoned me, on my cellular phone besides that, and they have suggested that they know how to cut about \$500,000, without hurting at all their salary scale and the 12 days off and what have you.

Apparently the Ontario Provincial Police have what they call a quarter century club: 26 different gatherings, banquets, throughout the province to recognize those

members who have 25 years or more in the force. They're saying that in these tough times we don't need this quarter century club spending probably \$15,000 or \$20,000—and I don't know how much. Those were suggestions to me by OPP officers.

I ask the government, have you checked with anyone before you brought in this very ill fated legislation that you will be applying to your so-called friends? I have difficulty with that.

**Municipalities:** I represent 23 very rural municipalities in the riding of Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry and East Grenville, and when I speak to employees of the municipalities, I find that by and large some of the smaller ones probably have five or six employees and some of the larger ones may go up to 15 or 20. But I find the majority of these employees at the municipal level are not at the \$30,000 threshold.

**Mr Wiseman:** They have no problems.

**Mr Villeneuve:** They have no problems, the member for Durham West says. Well, I can show you what they're being cut by, and if indeed the cuts come through as I have seen them, a municipality with 10 employees, five of whom make more than \$30,000, is being chopped \$21,285. It's pretty big when you stretch it over five employees, and all of the municipalities that I represent are in that ballpark.

They have, because of very difficult economic times in the province of Ontario, led the way in attempting to reduce the costs. The costs have been reduced over the past number of years. They led the way. The government of Ontario is just now starting to realize what's happening. These municipalities knew that indeed their tax base was eroding, mostly an agricultural tax base, and yes, they have attempted to do their tightening of their belts, and now they're being told, and I could go down the whole list here, everything from \$6,300—no, the village of Finch had \$4,700 cut—to somewhere in the area of \$40,000 from one of the larger municipalities.

1800

Those are pretty big cuts to municipalities that have already suffered the pain, and this is in an area where the economy has been most difficult for quite a number of years. It surrounds the city of Cornwall. I know one of the government members, when my colleague from Cornwall brought in a private member's motion to attempt to move one of the newly formed crown corporations to the city of Cornwall, for some reason said that he figured the people of Cornwall were crying wolf. I'm here to tell you that if they're crying wolf, then I will resign my seat. I have seen the difficult times that the people in the city of Cornwall and surrounding area are facing. There is no doubt about it: 3,000 jobs lost, not to return. Times are very, very difficult.

I want to talk about the critic area I cover, which is Agriculture and Food. The Minister of Agriculture and Food is a pretty good friend of mine. Certainly we have our political, I guess, discussions and areas that we don't agree on, but by and large he's a person I respect very much and certainly an honourable gentleman.

The government asked the minister and the ministry to cut the spending within the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. They cut 10% last year. They cut 10% again this year. I say to you, if all of the ministries within this government had cut 10% last year and 10% this year, as did the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, we would have no deficit in this province. Twenty per cent of \$53 billion is somewhere between \$10 billion and \$11 billion, and that's basically the problem we have with Ontario's economy right now.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Villeneuve:** I see the Minister of Housing says no. Those are the facts.

Agriculture provides, directly and indirectly, some 20% of the jobs within the province of Ontario. The production of food, the processing of food, the transportation of food, the handling of food, whatever, provides 20% of the jobs. That very important ministry is down now to 1% of the entire budget of the province of Ontario.

The partners of this government, should they have had to take the kind of reduction in income that farmers have had to endure and live with with very little support from governments, would indeed have a very legitimate bone of contention and be probably in an area where their credibility would be very, very difficult to dispute.

The credibility of some of the union leaders is always interesting, because they are always in a position where it will never be enough when they're bargaining. Yes, they have to come to an understanding, they have to come to an agreement; however, they generally ask for pie in the sky and then settle for something else. Everyone goes into negotiations knowing that. But the credibility is difficult to accept when those things are occurring. There's a great deal of posturing.

However, when we go back to Agriculture and Food, one of the very basic industries within our province, times are most difficult. World prices for grain have completely come apart at the seams, the cost of production continues to climb and profit margins are very small, if indeed they exist at all.

If we factor out the farm tax rebate—which is not support for agriculture; it's simply returning that portion or the approximate portion of real estate taxes on farm real estate and farm buildings that is attributable to the school boards—we find that the total budget for agriculture in 1990 was less than 1%, in 1991 it was 0.87%, in 1992 it was 0.75% and now it is below 0.75%. That is the portion of the entire provincial budget that is



basically there to support agriculture and all of the related industries within that food production, processing and transportation network.

I say again, if these other ministries had been able to follow the example that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food has been forced to do by this government, we would have no deficit in this province at all.

We go back to Agriculture again. The ministry shut down two of its five agricultural colleges, and I think that's somewhat of a very sad situation and indicates to me that agriculture and the training of people to produce food for us is not a very important priority to this government. Centralia and New Liskeard had been operating for a number of years. Yes, the enrolment was down somewhat. However, no negotiations occurred. Where can we amalgamate some of the—

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** A point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I believe you're not in your seat. I cannot accept your point of order. The member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry, you have the floor.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Mr Speaker, I believe there is no quorum in the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please check if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for S-D-G & East Grenville.

**Mr Villeneuve:** I see my friend and colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food just came in. He's watching the monitor very closely.

Back to the cuts that occurred to and within the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. The two colleges: I think it was a travesty to have them both close down. Certainly, there should have been some negotiations occur to see if indeed some programs that were not as popular as others might have been able to be axed and yet maintain the colleges as we've known them for a number of years. Both New Liskeard and Centralia got cut off completely.

The dairy inspection program, which consists of a number of people who had been doing farm inspections, plant inspections and milk-quality or dairy-quality inspections for many years, some 26 out of a staff of 36 across the province were cut by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, immediately after they had been told they need not worry or expect any cutbacks.

These are pretty rough situations within a ministry that is so important as far as I'm concerned. The production of food and the related industries to that should be the number one priority in this province and for this government. We don't see where they are

recognizing that particular department as important at all.

I have here a letter from the Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education. They again were leading the government because they did cut their costs of operation very substantially in 1992 and now they're faced with some very heavy cuts which they've already pared down to as little as they could. Here are some of the comments:

"In 1992, the Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education made significant expenditure reductions, putting in motion a three-year plan. Unfortunately, because the board was one year ahead of the provincial government in implementing its plan, it now appears these efforts will not be recognized within the requirements of the expenditure control plan and the social contract."

Signed by Mark Darrock, chairman of the board.

**1810**

Again, a letter signed by the director of education, Mr Kinsella: "It is similar to the method the ministry used for those boards who did not implement junior kindergarten." Mr Kinsella is offering to the government some ways around, as opposed to, the social contract legislation. "Each was given an opportunity to present a case as to why they could not implement the program. We would appreciate the same opportunity in relation to the expenditure control plan and the social contract. Those boards that have made the appropriate expenditure reductions and can demonstrate the fact should be given the chance to present their case. Once accepted, then the expenditure reductions would be recognized as meeting the requirements of expenditure control plans and the social contract."

We're in an area where our school board's assessment base is not rich by any stretch of the imagination. It has had to be very careful over the years, particularly in the recession beginning in 1990, and it continues in such a fashion. So the government, whether the legislation is implemented or not, I believe must recognize, with school boards and with municipalities, exactly where the cuts have occurred, and if they've occurred in the last year or 18 months, they also should be recognized and not punished for doing exactly what the government at Queen's Park should have been doing two years ago.

The conservation authorities: I found it an interesting private member's motion, and I see the member for Grey here. The conservation authorities are meeting here in Toronto pursuant to the private member's motion from the member for Grey that was approved by this Legislature last Thursday. They are in a position where their cost to operate is making it imperative for them to start selling real estate to pay their taxes—not a very appropriate situation when these conservation authorities own lands that are considered ecologically fragile, some wetlands, lands that must and should be preserved.

We have a situation where the conservation authorities—I see the Minister of Natural Resources is here, and I presume he had a meeting with them or his officials had a meeting with them today. I certainly hope they were able to come to some sort of agreeable solution so that these conservation authorities are not forced into selling real estate or other capital assets to pay their taxes.

I also want to remind the Minister of Natural Resources while he's here that we had a very major landslide in the south conservation authority watershed on Sunday. Almost three kilometres of ground slid into the river, an area that had been expropriated by governments a number of years ago. Thank goodness no one was killed, but we had a very major landslide. All the responsible people are meeting down there today to attempt to find a solution, but money will have to be forthcoming.

This was a freak of nature and not unanticipated, thank goodness, and provisions had been made. But the river is now blocked and there will be contaminated water supplies for a number of the towns downstream. I gather the water is just now making its way through.

We had a landslide in that area in 1971. I recall it well and you may as well, Mr Speaker, because you come from that area. It blocked the river. What occurs the following spring is that sediment or dirt from the bottom of the river winds up on the flooded land. What we had in that year were a number of farm ditches that were plugged with ground that came up from the bottom of the river after the landslide, and a cover of ground upwards of 12 inches on top of existing grass and hay crops, and reseeded had to be done. So we have a fairly major problem there and a major expenditure coming up.

I think this government must address the abuses in the system, the OHIP card I think being number one. We're looking at estimates of between \$700 million and \$900 million annually of abuse by people who should not be receiving health care here in the province of Ontario. That kind of money must be addressed.

We have a situation—and the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation I'm glad to see is here today. Her parliamentary assistant was at the opening of the new dock facilities at the Upper Canada Village marina a month and a half ago. The St Lawrence Parks Commission has been asked to cut very substantially. They now have had to close a park known as the Raisin Region Conservation Authority park. We have several interested people. There are 100 serviced sites at that park. It's about one kilometre away from Lake St Francis on the Raisin River, and easy access by boat; one river flows into the other. But what we have here is a park, paid for totally by public funds, which will have to remain closed. At least it looks like it will have to remain closed.

I think that's a travesty, because in the area, this particular park could serve families. It's out of the way. It's not along the St Lawrence and therefore it would be considered secondary.

However, the park is closed, and because of union agreements—and they call them successor rights—they're going to leave that park closed, a park totally built with public funds, with a number of people ready to lease it, keep the grass trimmed and make it available to constituents within the riding that I represent. Yet because of a number of bureaucratic requirements, this will not happen. I think that's a shame, and I appreciate that the minister and her parliamentary assistant are looking at this, but the whole system is jammed and stalled.

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** We'll look into it.

**Mr Villeneuve:** Yes, the government is here, and, "We'll look into it." That's what we want to hear. That may be the last thing we want to hear. Get the government out of my hair and I'll be able to make things go.

I want to touch on just another subject, and I don't have a lot of time left, but we have three governments in Canada that call themselves social democrats. Well, because of them and because of other reasons but primarily because of the government of Ontario, Alberta Tories won a very glowing election last week. I think it was primarily based on cutting taxes and getting the government out of the affairs of the nation.

We do know that more companies leave our province, first because of high taxes, second because of government interference and third because of requirements by all levels of government to submit to all the requirements and the needs of government. This is a fact, and this has been proven. Lower wage costs come about fourth on the list of why companies go elsewhere; taxes and government interference are numbers 1 and 2.

I think this government is starting to get the message. Probably this government is just as much responsible for a Tory win in Alberta as any other, because the three socialist governments, the one in BC, the one in Saskatchewan and the one in Ontario, are not exactly the model that the rest of Canada wants to follow.

In 1985 I was a member of a Progressive Conservative government, and people for some reason thought the alternatives were better, and yes, I recall well. As a matter of fact, I was a member of the Frank Miller cabinet when the day came in late June that the marriage was on, the fix was in and the Tories were out. That was very interesting, because at that time a lot of people said: "Ah, now, the Liberals. We know what they stand for. They're awful good administrators and they will put this province on the map."

Well, they put the province on the map all right. They doubled the taxes, they doubled the take from the



public, and lo and behold, they started to ask for more bureaucratic requirements, studies. They were very heavy on studying, and restudying. They poured more money into paper than you can shake a stick at, and that's when the economy was growing by leaps and bounds. They're kind of proud to say that, through a lot of good luck, they were able to balance the budget one year. In spite of the fact that they had anticipated almost a \$1-billion deficit, they managed, through a lot of good luck, to balance the budget.

**1820**

Of course, they talk a lot about that, but they seem to forget and don't talk about the \$10 billion of additional total debt that the province of Ontario got under a Liberal administration, I guess a Liberal-NDP government, because from 1985 to 1987 that's what it was. When the Liberals would announce an expenditure, the NDP would say: "That's fine, but not nearly enough. We need more." They got more. The public of Ontario got more.

Mr Speaker, as I sit sometimes in the chair you're in and sometimes in my regular seat, I find it amazing that they're all looking for someone else to blame. Yet who pays the bills? The taxpayers of Ontario. They pay all the bills. They also assume the debt of governments, and governments are notorious for just continuing to get into debt and forgetting about paying it off, because spending public money is one of the easiest things in the world. Then you've got to live with it.

You've got to live with the consequences of mortgaging the future, the future of young people, the future of businesses that may never come here because of high taxes and government interference. That's what the record doesn't say or show: those potential businesses that never do get off the ground or set up shop. We do know that in Ontario, as well as just about anywhere else, small and medium-sized businesses create the wealth, pay the taxes and employ the people. We must never, ever lose track of that.

As I sum up this somewhat mixed-emotion presentation, I say I will be supporting the legislation, but it must be amended. My colleagues have stated the amendments. We cannot gut a contract that was negotiated and signed in good faith. We must wait for that contract to expire. We must freeze the size of the civil service and we must, every time a contract comes up, negotiate. That's what it's all about.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any questions or any comments?

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The member from Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry has—

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** And East Grenville.

**Mr Stockwell:** And East Grenville; that's quite a name for a riding. He has highlighted quite a few points that we discussed in caucus. I don't think I'm speaking

out of caucus to say that there was some handwringing about this piece of legislation, but one agreement among the group was that there had to be some amendments accepted by this government. We think they're reasonable. They're not onerous at all. They still would allow this government to save the money it is looking to save, but it allows for a system of checks and balances.

I think one of the most difficult things for anyone to accept as part of this legislation is the absolute and thorough control government will have over all aspects of the social contract. You will be able to reopen the contracts, roll back the wages and demand pay pause days. People could get fired and have no recourse. The recourse they did have was to the legal system. You've taken that away, taken it away through the social contract, and you've done so in such a draconian fashion that it allows no protection for the workers any more.

I understand where you came from, but since this mantle of power has been hoisted on you you've run around, in a lot of instances, like chickens with your heads cut off, from pillar to post, making decisions that absolutely haven't got any basis in the foundation for which your party was organized.

The social contract, reopening of contracts, clawing back wages—we're looking for the amendments we are putting forward. Mr Villeneuve has outlined those clearly. He's told you where we want to see this contract go. He's told you how the savings can be made. If you're looking for public support, I think the first thing you will do is bring in the support of the opposition parties by accepting their amendments and making this thing go forward in a much better fashion.

**Mr Callahan:** We hear the Conservative Party saying that it has flip-flopped. They're not sure whether they're going to support this legislation or whether they're going to vote against it. They tell us there are amendments they will bring forward that are going to turn this into a fair bill that's going to save everybody. It's interesting to listen to that salvation speech over there. Yet we have not seen the amendments; we have no idea what the amendments are.

**Mr Murdoch:** Where have you been, have you been sleeping or something?

**Mr Callahan:** No, no, you haven't. I beg to differ. In any event, they seem to have a different position every day. Every three months, they have a different position. They've had a different position each time.

They talk about controlling expenditures. I have to tell you that the word "deficit" in the province of Ontario did not arise during the Liberal administration; it arose well in advance of that.

The net result is that when they talk about this having been foisted upon the government of the day, that's not the case at all. The government of the day has failed to

even address the question of where there could be expenditures saved.

I will have an opportunity in a few minutes to speak at length on this, because in terms of how you solve a problem, you don't solve it by hammering the people of this province. I speak of the workers as well as the taxpayers. You sit down in a rational way and try to discover, what is the waste in government? Where can we cut expenditures? You do that first, and I suggest that hasn't been done.

The Conservative government seems to be the tax fighters, yet on the one hand they've got one position, the next day they've got another position, the next day another position. I'll be referring to those in my speech. I find it absolutely incredible that they've really not given us their position. There seems to be mixed emotions in their caucus in terms of how they're going to deal with this. I guess we'll find out on the day the vote is actually taken.

**Mr Jordan:** It's a privilege to have a short time to comment on this very important legislation, I must say. But first I would like to comment on my colleague's presentation. I think it was an excellent presentation. He not only covered the purpose and the content of the bill, but also the reason the bill was required.

When you cover the reason the bill is required, you have to ask yourself, why are we in this dilemma at all? How did we get here? As our member has pointed out, the reason we're here, the real beginning, started with the opposition. Their philosophy was tax, tax, tax and then spend, spend, spend. The philosophy of the government is spend, spend, spend and then tax, tax, tax. So what happens? Everybody's caught in an unprepared situation.

When they took over the government, they had the feeling, and they were very secure, that they were taking over a set of books that was well balanced. Of course, you and I know—

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** They were balanced with the other set.

**Mr Jordan:** You're right; I thank you. You see, \$3.5 billion was sitting there that had to be accounted for, and then with your Agenda for People ahead of you to spend, spend, spend, naturally we are finding ourselves in the situation we are in.

But it seems to me that the government and the Premier especially have realized the situation they're in. He has listened to our leader, Mike Harris. He has realized that legislation is required. He has brought in legislation. Naturally, the legislation doesn't necessarily agree with the type of legislation we would have brought in, but of course we wouldn't have been in the situation. So there you are.

However, we are going to be given the opportunity, I hope, to make some amendments to that legislation

that will make it acceptable to us and we can vote for it and, hopefully, get this government back on track and down the road show a plus on the books.

1830

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** It's almost like the third party has gone to sleep, has woken up—

**Mr Stockwell:** Shhhh, shhhh.

**Mr Murdoch:** Shhhh, shhhh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Order.

**Mr Mammoliti:** There are obviously some flat tires there, holes in some of the—

**Mr Stockwell:** Shhhh.

**Mr Murdoch:** Shhhh.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Mr Speaker, some order here.

They have fallen asleep and literally overnight have turned into these labour relations experts, trying to tell us how to deal with employees, trying to tell us what language to use and what legislation would be appropriate in this circumstance. I don't want to listen to that.

The member had said earlier that he's been in the Legislature for 10 years. He would have been here when that government, the Conservative government, took away anything that crown employees 10 years ago had negotiated in their collective agreements. You did it with one swoop. There was no negotiating, and now they have the gall to criticize this government for attempting to negotiate a package so that we can get out of a bind the Liberals next door to them created. They're the ones that got us into this mess.

**Mr Stockwell:** The Liberals got you into a \$25-billion debt in two years. Oh, George, you will see communists under rocks next.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Yes, the Liberals did it to us. The Liberals put us into a debt we'll never forget, and now we're having to make up for the problems. Spend, spend, spend; somebody said that earlier. The Liberals did that and they did it consistently: 33 tax increases as well.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Your time has expired. The honourable member for S-D-G & East Grenville has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Villeneuve:** To the member for Yorkview, that's exactly what I was talking about: When Big Brother giveth, Big Brother taketh away. He has proved my point beyond the shadow of a doubt. He doesn't want to listen, and it's Big Brother's turn to take away. That's amazing. I could not have made my point any better. He does not want to listen, doesn't even believe people like my colleague from Etobicoke West, who has been in business, employs people in a number of businesses, was a municipal politician and is now elected here: "We don't listen to people like the member for Etobicoke



West, I'm sorry. He happens to be an employer of people, so we can't listen to him. He's poison." I'm telling you, it's terrible. That's the attitude that comes from this government.

To my colleague from Brampton South, he does sound a lot like a lawyer, because he is a lawyer and he is a good one. But he has not seen the six amendments. If I had more than a minute, I would read them for him very quickly. They're very simple amendments, and they make sense.

It's not the magic wand that the Liberals have, that Cinderella touches it and it turns to gold. I'm sorry, those days are over. They had those days from the mid-1980s to the end of the 1980s, when they managed to balance the budget in spite of themselves and not by good management; by a lot of very good luck they did that.

They're now coming back and saying, "The Tories don't know where they are." I'm sorry; we have a very solid position here. I heard the member for Oriole, just before question period, stating that she didn't know the Tory position either. They should be here more often. There's a problem. I hope I have helped a little bit.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Callahan:** I'm amazed that another member from the government wouldn't have gotten up and spoken on this. I want to praise you, Mr Speaker, as I did before, for taking the strong stand you did in terms of your principles, which seems not to be emulated or adopted by any of your colleagues, or your former colleagues, of the New Democratic Party.

I'd like to talk about this in terms of what might happen if we simply let the government pass its bill. It might be very interesting. We could very cavalierly stand here tonight, not debate the bill and let the government pass it; and it will pass, no doubt, because there's a majority government. But I would predict that the net result of this will be that we will be involved in appeals right up to the Supreme Court of Canada. This bill clearly will not stand the test of a constitutional challenge. It is the most draconian, the most one-sided, the most dictatorial bill that has ever been placed before a democratic Parliament.

Let's say I'm right, and I think I am right, and perhaps my view is shared by other people who have taken the opportunity to look at this bill. Let's say I'm right and that it does go to the Supreme Court of Canada. Recognizing the length of time it takes to wend its way through the various courts up to the Supreme Court of Canada, we could be looking at as much as three years.

If I'm correct and that happens, what happens to the myriad partners referred to in the schedule of this act? How do they set their budgets? How can they possibly decide how much money they need to operate? How can

they understand what services they can provide?

I'll tell you what's happening. In recognition of that fact, this is what's already happening among our transfer partners. In my municipality, my city holds a July 1 celebration, as they do in many areas and corners of Ontario and around Canada; it's our birthday. They have fireworks; they may have some entertainment for the young kids. It's probably the only free thing people can have if they can't afford to put their kids in skating or into some sport or ballet or whatever. It's an opportunity for them to get together as a family. It's an opportunity for them to see something as a family that doesn't cost them anything.

My municipality, rightly or wrongly, because of the fear of what's going to happen with this social contract, either legislated or negotiated, is reluctant to hold that festivity this year. No one comes forward with the opportunity to pay for that, so in my community, those people who can ill-afford to put their children into various events are going to be deprived of the opportunity of going to Chinguacousy Park. It's a great celebration, a great family event, and they're not going to be able to do that this year. I suggest to you that they won't be able to do it in 1994 and they won't be able to do it in 1995, while this bill wheels its way through the legal process, which I guarantee you it will do, and everybody's left in total disarray about just what is going to happen.

I suggest to you, as well, that if you drive through any of the municipalities in Ontario—certainly mine is representative of everybody else's—you're seeing situations where simple services such as grass cutting are not taking place. Municipalities just don't know what to do. They're left in a total quandary.

My colleague from Brampton North and I appeared before our city council to try and help it understand what the social contract was all about and how it would impact on the services that could be provided to the taxpayers of our riding, of our city. To begin with, you hit them with taxes on insurance, after the budget had been struck, which is going to impact significantly on the people of that city. That's number one; that's the first problem you gave them.

You now give them this problem of this thing called the social contract, which leaves them in total disarray. They have absolutely no idea what they're going to do. The school boards have no idea what they're going to do. And, which to me is absolutely the most insensitive thing this government could possibly do, children's aid societies, which are mandated by law to look after children and protect children, haven't got a clue what they're getting, haven't got a clue how much money they're going to have to help these people. My advice to them, and I may go jail for it, is that I told them: "Go ahead and spend it. You're duty-bound by statute to look after these young people, to protect them." And

I said, "If you don't get the money, then go and sue the government for it."

And this is precisely what's going to happen. The people out there are in such disarray over this whole process. It's not the concept; it's the process. I don't think anybody will argue that we can't allow a deficit to continue to build as it has over successive governments and pass that on to our children as their heritage. We have to do something about it. But I suggest that what you've done is you've thrown out to the people of this province, all of our transfer partners, a piece of legislation or a philosophy that they can't understand. They don't know what it means. They don't know what it's going to cost them. They don't know what it means in terms of reduction of service.

One thing that is clear in this bill is the fact that with people in essential services, you're saying: "We'll solve that problem. We'll have them take their 12 days off a year, 36 in all, on the days that they would receive paid holidays."

1840

Let's be upfront with the people of this province. What is that doing? Think about it. When they take their 36 days at the end of the three-year period of this social contract, someone has to take their place in those essential services. That means that you have suddenly dropped on to municipalities, on to police forces, on to everybody else, the cost of replacing those people.

Let's just take a police force. How can you possibly hire replacements for these members of the police force three years from now unless you have trained them, some sort of training so they can take the place of those people who are off for the 36 days? It's impossible.

What's the plan? What plan does the government have to deal with that? Or is it simply a matter that you figure you're not going to be around here after 1995, so the hell with it? "We'll get ourselves to look good for now. We'll get our budget down below the \$17 billion," which nobody ever believed anyway, "and we will pass on this obligation to the next party that forms the government."

That's the only thing I can think of. That's got to be exactly what you're doing. You're fed up with government; you don't know how to deal with it. So what do you do? "We create smoke and mirrors and we pass it on. We pass the baton on to the next government so that it can get us out of this mess."

For God's sake, I plead with you to at least play fair with the transfer partners, to make it clear to them what their obligations are going to be down the line. Don't play the smoke and mirror political game with them that you're playing, that the Treasurer did in his budget by creating three crown corporations to hide assets and debts to make it look better in the budget.

Let's let the people, the taxpayers of this province, at

least have a fair shot at knowing what the problem is. Let's also give the people who provide the services the opportunity to be able to pare down expenses so we can all meet this mutual objective, but at the same time, let them plan for how they're going to secure revenues. You're not doing that.

I venture to say that the people in this Legislature who pass this legislation are one day going to find it very difficult to face up to the citizens of their ridings, because the citizens of their ridings will have a long memory. They will remember what you did to them. They will remember what you did to their services. They will remember just how they're going to get a big hit three years from now which will just fall out of the sky because of all this hanky-panky that's going on right now with this government.

I find it interesting that everyone over there seems to be in total accord, with the exception of the member for Victoria-Haliburton and, I understand, the member for Perth, who had the guts to speak out against it. You're playing a game, which may be nice to keep you out of the rain and no heavy lifting for the job you've got, but it's not playing fair with the people who are going to have to provide services and are going to have to look after all those necessary things in our province.

Young offenders' facilities, I see they're being attacked.

Court reporters: The Attorney General is thinking about bringing in a process which will in effect eliminate about 700 to 800 jobs, 95% of whom are women, most of them single parents. She's going to replace them with some megamachine that will be in the central belly of a courthouse that will record everything that's said in every criminal trial and civil trial in that courthouse. They're doing this without even having taken a pilot project. I find it absolutely incredible that they would do that.

The process was tried in British Columbia. British Columbia had a legislative committee look at it and it determined that it wanted to return to the old system because it was more reliable. I asked the Attorney General about it. I said, "Attorney General, have you done a pilot project?" She said: "Yes. It's in existence in the Ottawa courthouse." Well, I have to tell the Attorney General that she's totally wrong. It is not in existence in the Ottawa courthouse.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** It certainly is.

**Mr Callahan:** The Minister of Housing should also check into it, because I have checked with the legal profession there and it is not in existence.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** You've got it wrong. You've got the wrong information.

**Mr Callahan:** Unless the Minister of Housing has actually gone to the Ottawa courthouse and looked at it



and seen it there, she's wrong. I won't say she's lying, but she's wrong.

In any event, here we've got all this concern about single parents, which is understandable, women who have to work to support their children and pay for their day care, and you are about to, in the stroke of a pen, eliminate something like 700 or 800 jobs, 95% women's jobs in terms of court reporting, for this fling you're going to take with this magic microphone.

I can throw a couple of problems at you. If somebody lies in court, how are you going to prove it? You don't have a court reporter who has been in court and heard the lie and reported it faithfully able to come into court and say, "This is what happened."

The court of appeals in New Jersey recently was reported as having complained and thrown out a very serious conviction of a very serious murder in New Jersey because it couldn't rely upon this new system which it had down there too, this cost-saving event. I suggest to you this cost-saving event is going to result in danger on our streets, people being released on the streets who are dangerous people, simply because this government didn't bother to look at the question of whether that was a cost saving or whether it's going to cost us millions in terms of money and in terms of human agony down the road.

*Laughter.*

**Mr Callahan:** Mr Speaker, I wonder if we could have the laughing cease. I think this is a very important issue and one that should be discussed in some degree of seriousness as opposed to ministers of the crown laughing about it. I hope they're not laughing at this.

When one looks at the whole situation of our school system, how do our school boards plan in terms of the potentiality of this legislation being challenged in the courts? Three years can go by there too. The school boards will be in total disarray. They'll have absolutely no idea how to plan.

I talked to my school board trustees; I talked to my city councillors. I wonder how many members of the government have bothered to talk to them to find out just how significantly concerned and upset they are about this and the fact that they don't understand what the government is trying to do.

The government says, "Here's our piece of legislation," and the Conservatives say, "We've got these amendments that will deal with the legislation." I suggest to them that regardless of what they bring in, unless it's a right of appeal or unless it's a right to take some of the power away from the minister, this legislation is going to fall. It will not be upheld. It will not be capable of being upheld.

When I look at some of the things such as the cutback on expenditures for legal aid clinics—these are the people who are the poor. They can't afford to go out

and hire their own lawyer, and you people are going to put a hit on them. That's just one more example of how I think you people have lost your principles totally. In an effort, in a frenzy to appear like you're cutting costs, you just cut them indiscriminately.

I'll tell you what I think part of the problem is: I think the ministers themselves have not spent enough time understanding their portfolios and therefore knowing them better than the civil servants do. When the Treasurer came in, suddenly discovering that there was a \$17-billion, or whatever it was, possible deficit, and said, "Well, cut 10%," the minister says to the minions, "Cut 10%," but doesn't bother to check where they're cutting it from, and suddenly you get cuts that cut and bleed.

That's really where the danger is. You may think the people of Ontario are going to be excited about the fact that you've reduced these expenditures or made the attempt to reduce them, but when they find the spinoff from that, when they find that these cuts are in places where they shouldn't have been cut instead of the places where they should have been cut, you're going to find that the anger of the people of this province will be unsurpassed. You will find it out very shortly.

As I said when I began, we as the opposition probably could take advantage if we wanted to be totally partisan and simply let you pass the legislation and let you suffer the fallout from it, but I don't think that's fair to the people of this province. If there's one purpose of any of us being in this Legislature it is to ensure, if we're on the government side, that what we're doing is in the best interests of the people of this province, and if we're on the opposition side, to point out to you where the mistakes are so we can rectify them.

In fact, that's what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to say to you, slow down, because this legislation—I don't know where you got your legal opinions from but I suggest you get a few more, because I think this legislation, if it's not constitutionally invalid, will be tied up in the courts, as I said, for three years and you won't see it come out until those three years. In the meantime you've lost all this time to rectify what's happening in the province.

I look at the Conservatives. One minute, they've told us they're going to support it, the next minute they're not going to support it, and the next minute they've got amendments. In two short months Mike Harris and the Tories have both supported and opposed the social contract. First they said the \$2 billion in cuts wasn't enough. Then they accused the NDP of going too far to get the \$2 billion. Well, which is it? You can't ride the horse both ways, side-saddle and left and right.

**1850**

They've demanded legislation to enforce the social contract and then announced that the legislation wasn't

necessary, again a flip-flop. They proposed simplistic alternatives and then changed the numbers they used to support their proposals less than a week later.

They sound like they don't like the social contract bill, but they can't tell us how they'll vote on it. Just as an example, Mike Harris starts off in favour. This is reported in Hansard, April 14, 1993. He says, "I applauded the initial announcements that you were going to talk with public sector employees and with representatives of a million of them."

Mike Harris, in Hansard of April 28, 1993, said: "I will support you to go even further; you know that as well. I want to state clearly today that I will support legislation—bang, bang, bang, first, second, third reading—one day past a realistic deadline." We're still debating it. Has he changed his attitude on that? Is this another flip-flop?

Then he said the legislation isn't needed. I quote from Hansard of June 7, 1993. This is Mike Harris, the leader of the third party: "I presented you and your Treasurer with a fourth option.... There's a three-year plan with natural attrition, with a hiring freeze. It would mean a permanent downsizing of government, no unnecessary layoffs, enough flexibility to ensure priority services are maintained, and quite frankly, no legislation is even required to implement that one." A change again.

He seems to change his mind perhaps as often as he changes his tie; I don't know. Two days later, legislation was back on. I quote from Hansard of June 9, 1993: "We have told you that your contract talks could not possibly succeed. The union leaders had no chance, with credibility, to keep their jobs and negotiate rolling back contracts unless three commonsense things were put on the table, unless you are firm on three areas. One, the amount, \$2 billion. Secondly, the deadline....the legislation, the hammer that you plan to bring in." That's Mike Harris in Hansard of June 9, 1993.

Mike Harris on June 14, 1993, is quoted as saying in Hansard, "I'm serving notice today as well on this piece of legislation that I and my caucus colleagues will be putting forward amendments to this bill."

Five days later, "bang, bang, bang" was back on the shelf. This is Mike Harris of June 1993, commenting on social contract legislation, "Retroactive rollbacks, gutting the negotiation process, creating the chaos out there is not the right way to go."

We have the government over there not putting something clear forward so that the transfer partners, all those transfer partners can deal with it. If you look at the bill, it's absolutely amazing the transfer partners that are involved. There are people who are helpless, who are unfortunate, who can't help themselves, who can't fight for themselves who are being damaged by this bill. I'd read some of them, but time doesn't permit.

You've got the NDP doing that and then you've got the Conservatives over here not knowing which shoe they put on first in the morning, and then you expect the people of this province to understand what's going on, to accept it. I guess they do accept, and I can accept, and I think every member of the Legislature can accept, the fact that we have been spending too much. We continue to spend simply because we think we have cheques left, that we can write them, instead of looking at our bank balance and saying, "We can't spend any more."

But aren't there other ways to do it? I've suggested many ways to many treasurers; for instance, your favourite topic, Mr Speaker, lotteries. We paid \$13 million, maybe higher, and I bet that's probably the highest we have ever paid on a 649 payoff, to one citizen of the province of Ontario. I've suggested to treasurers, why don't you do what they do in the United States? "You don't get the \$13 million, thank you. You get a life annuity which is equivalent to a monthly payout of that \$13 million." You take 30% right off the top—that's additional revenue for the government—and you put that in the consolidated revenue fund to offset our cost of providing services.

We discovered in the standing committee on public accounts, and the auditor's report reported it, that \$120 million—the thing that frightens me, having been down here for eight years, is that doesn't even scare me any more; we talk in millions like it's dollars—of taxpayers' dollars were paid out in family benefits that were either through fraud or mistake. I'll tell you how they collected it. They collected 10% of that. Then I asked the public accounts committee to have the people in the government who do the collection to come before us, because I wanted to find out how many people we have in the collection department where this is collected. I discovered that the cost of collecting was 20%. So we were already out of pocket. We may as well have written off the \$120 million. They couldn't see putting this out in the private sector and letting them take a crack at it, or selling it to them for a third of the amount and getting that money and putting it in the consolidated revenue fund.

We also found that although ministries are required by Management Board policy to report debts, after they are outstanding for a certain period of time, to this collection agency, many didn't. They didn't bother. There were no teeth that could require them to monitor this and to report to the collection agency. The auditor wanted the public accounts committee to instruct him to investigate that matter, but that was defeated, by my recollection, by the majority members on the public accounts committee. There's \$120 million that has just floated off.

I understand as well that Hydro's spent half a million dollars—and I'm having this investigated by the audi-



tor—to buy furniture for the Hydro building. When the interior decorator decided it didn't fit the decor, they didn't use it. What they're doing is hiding it in a warehouse; they move it from warehouse to warehouse around this province so nobody will find out about it and therefore embarrass the government. We've got a special audit. I hope it's going to be passed by the members of the government and they won't try to beat it down and hide it. But it's going to be debated as soon as possible before public accounts and we get the auditor to go out and find that out.

I'm told by a Supreme Court judge that at 361 University Avenue, which is the General Division court, there was something in the neighbourhood of a half a million dollars of new furniture put in. The place was wallpapered at major expense for the public. It wasn't needed.

What's going on here? Is somebody asleep at the switch? These are the accounts, these are the amounts of money. If you continue to spend, then you're depleting the moneys that are available to provide jobs and adequate services for the people of this province. Your stewardship is absolutely incredible, that you would allow these moneys to slip out of your hands.

Instead, what do you do? The Treasurer increases the cost of buying a home in terms of registration fees. That's his way of getting it: Grab the revenues. I'll tell you, if you went into a registry office anywhere in this province, you could shoot off a cannon and you wouldn't kill anybody except staff. That's how bad the situation is. That situation has been caused by a number of things. The taxes that your government has brought in have simply stymied business. They're not prepared to get involved in business; it's too expensive.

I see people losing their homes every day. My son articulated for a law firm in Toronto. They had more power of sales—that's when you can't pay your mortgage any more and they sell it out from under you—in this province than they had in the Dirty Thirties. What do you people do about it? You up the cost.

If you die in this province, it has now become extremely expensive. Instead of having the guts, as you said you were going to do, to bring in some sort of inheritance tax, you went in the back door and upped the fees to probate a will, to administer a will. You dealt with the most vulnerable people, people who scrimped so that when they passed away, they could pass on some money to their family. What did you do? You cut a great deal of that out of it by the probate fees, these increased fees.

Wake up. Wake up and smell the roses. There has to be a million ways we could save money in terms of the expenditures that are going on in the government; this government and every other government. But for God's sake, let's not just suddenly decide that we're going to kill the fly with a hammer. Let's not decide that we're

going to do it, that we're going to set a precedent in this House, by passing a piece of legislation that I said in a comment on one of the other speeches is the most draconian, the most undemocratic piece of legislation that I have ever read.

#### 1900

I challenge every one of the members: If you're interested in looking after your constituents, if you're interested in avoiding the possibility that we will pass a document out of this House and set a precedent for dictatorial powers, if you're interested, read it; if you've got any guts and if you care about the people who elected you to this Legislature, read it. Because if you don't read it and you vote for it, you have committed one of the greatest frauds on the people who gave you a sacred trust and sent you to this Legislature.

Let's look for other ways to cut expenditures in government—I'm sure they're there—and let's stop passing taxes that interfere with the opportunity to create jobs, because that's what you're doing. The budget of the Treasurer was one that had no imagination. It was simply a hit, a hit at a bad time: It was a hit when people were down, an unfair hit. If it had been reviewed and looked at in a more careful and humane fashion, we might be bringing ourselves back up out of this recession, but certainly not with what's going on in this House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments?

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I wasn't going to use my two minutes, but I was provoked by the member when he said he doesn't know where Mike Harris stands. Mike Harris issued a news release on June 9 that he "today proposed a package of measures to ensure the public sector wage issue is finally resolved in the interests of all Ontarians, including public sector workers." I hope the member is listening.

"Harris's suggestions follow Bob Rae's announcement in the Legislature that sector-by-sector cost-cutting talks will resume, this time with clearly defined goals, a firm deadline and the prior tabling of enforcement legislation, as Harris had called for all along.

"Key elements of the Harris package include:

"—Establishing a realistic timetable for restraint;

"—"It's ridiculous to set an August 1 deadline for implementing measures which in some cases will be retroactive to January 1," Harris said.

"—Providing mediation:

"—"One of the reasons why the first talks collapsed was a lack of hard experience among participants in reforming large organizations," Harris said. "The Premier should therefore appoint someone to renew sectoral talks who's negotiated this process before—the auto industry, for example—where labour and management have worked together to produce a better product with a streamlined workforce."

"Harris suggested as possible candidates CAW president Buzz Hargrove, former OFL president Cliff Pilkey and veteran negotiator Vic Pathe."

"—Starting the attrition clock now:

"Attrition does not require legislation. Nor does it demand any employment or job security sacrifices on the part of current public servants.

"By adopting these measures, Harris said, the Premier will ensure that the following critical challenges could be met or exceeded:

"Fiscal targets contained in the 1993-94 NDP budget;

"Genuine consensus between government, union leaders and their membership;

"Permanent, structural downsizing of the cost and scope of the public sector.

"Ontarians are tired of waiting for action on downsizing government so we can get on with the task of upsizing the private sector and creating prosperity," Harris said. "But they want it done effectively and cooperatively, with tangible results. That is exactly the spirit in which these proposals are offered."

There you are.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? If there are none, the honourable member for Brampton South has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Callahan:** I have to respond to that, because Mr Harris has been reported as saying that we could save \$2 billion, and then it went to \$6 billion, through attrition. Think about it. If you have attrition and you put a hiring freeze on—let's just take the police force for an example, that through attrition your officers retire and you don't hire anybody else. Who's going to be looking after the province? The people watching have to realize, and I'm sure they do, that common sense says that principle by the third party leader is absolute nonsense.

I would say finally, though, that the New Democratic Party, with its legislation and this arrangement that it has to have essential services—and there are a lot of them: ambulance workers, you name it—if it is going to have them take the time off, during the three-year period, from their vacation, I think the public should understand very clearly that they are going to have to be replaced after the three-year period's over by replacement workers. We estimated that this would cost about \$3 billion.

What it means is that by saving the so-called \$2 billion that they're saying now, they're going to pay \$3 billion in three years. It would be far less injurious and probably far more beneficial if they borrowed the money from the bank; they could pay off the billion dollars interest on it for the next three years. You'd be in the same boat, and in fact there would be a lot fewer

people suffering.

I urge the government, every member, to look at the legislation, first, to see that it's unfair, and second, to look in their own areas and see where we could save money, and third, for God's sake, when you vote, don't let the government try to bully you into it because you're afraid you're going to lose your ten grand as a PA or as a whatever, whatever other special thing you have.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr McLean:** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill 48. We're all limited to half an hour and I may not use all that time, but I hope to have a few things to say about this social contract legislation and I hope some of the comments will be useful. I'm sure the Treasurer will be listening on his television set.

The legislation introduced by the Finance minister really has been a concern to the municipalities in this province. They've been confronted by enormous cuts to their transfer payments. The municipal employees' representatives acted in good faith by staying at the talks and remained committed to working out a solution with the government to cut the deficit. They wanted to save services and jobs and ensure that there were no new taxes.

The social contract legislation provides little assurance that savings will be found in compensation. Many of Ontario's 839 municipalities believe a wage freeze will not provide the savings required to offset the NDP government's recent slash of \$110 million in unconditional grants and the \$285-million cut to the public sector payroll. The government has left municipalities with no choice but to lay off employees and cut services. Municipal representatives are also alarmed about the distribution of the cuts to individual municipalities.

Throughout the social contract discussions, municipalities focused on the need to reduce the sectoral target and recommended that one quarter of this year's impact be deferred to the second quarter of 1996, making the amount for 1993 no more than \$150 million. This is a reasonable suggestion in recognition of the fiscal year problem facing municipalities across Ontario. The Premier has an obligation to direct his government to help reduce the impact of mid-year cuts on the municipalities in Ontario, which are facing some tough times.

Time is running out and the resumption of discussions must happen as soon as possible, that is, before the social contract legislation becomes law. Once again, the government has hit the average person squarely in the wallet with a budget that clobbers everyone in Ontario. The province is Yours to Discover and now it is Yours to Recover. The \$2-billion tax grab is the single largest in the provincial history, and the bulk of it will be borne by people who just are barely getting by as it is.



This budget means everybody will have less money in their pockets to spend. That's going to kill jobs and reverse the already fragile economic recovery. The same government that continues to grab for everybody's wallet also continues to download programs on to Ontario's 839 municipalities and is not providing the adequate funding which is needed.

To top it all off, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has taken back some of what it has already given the municipalities: more than \$110 million in unconditional grants. The unconditional grants to the county of Simcoe, the city of Orillia and the township of Medonte have been laid out for you, and I must say that Bob Rae's government is focusing on all 839 municipalities, which are now paying for his mistakes and for his increase in taxation.

When he came the first year, he thought he could spend his way out of the recession. Instead of that, it really did the opposite. As I am saying, you simply can't get 10 kilograms out of an eight-kilogram bag of anything.

1910

The Minister of Municipal Affairs will slash a total of \$275 million in transfer payments to Ontario's municipal sector. That will result in cuts in the county of Simcoe, some \$361 million, and in a city the size of Orillia, \$671,000; a population of approximately 25,000 to 26,000 people. I have been told that the council spent hours last night determining what they're going to do. They just have no idea what they're going to do when they are cut by \$671,000.

The town of Penetanguishene is being cut by \$107,000 for a population of approximately 5,400 or 5,600, a large amount of money. The little village of Coldwater, \$17,900. We look at the village of Elmvale, \$26,000; \$35,000 to Medonte township; \$59,000 to Orillia township; \$70,000 to Oro township; \$87,000 to Tiny township; \$63,000 to Mara township and \$12,000 to Rama township.

In the letter on June 14 to the municipalities to announce the transfer payments, he indicated that everyone—the government, employers, bargaining agents—is committed to ensuring that the impact of the fiscal reductions is distributed fairly. Well, many municipalities have already slashed their budgets and many of them have already cut the days of work. People have already agreed to take off Fridays or four or five days during the year.

Clearly, the employees, the workers, the bargaining agents, the municipalities and the Ontario PC caucus have taken up the cause of debt reduction, and we have been very strong on that. We want to get the spending under control. The only group not committed to this cause, from what I'm gathering over the past two years, has been the government. They have created chaos. The municipalities have brought down their

budgets, which have already made financial commitments to the local community.

As I said, our caucus has taken up the cause of debt reduction and spending controls. Mr Harris has been saying for three years now that we've got to have less government, reduce the size of government. In fact, we have offered the NDP government a plan which I believe would achieve permanent reductions in the size and cost of the public sector and allow for restructuring without the chaos and inequity that we would get in this Bill 48.

Our proposals have been:

(1) The PC caucus has urged the government to implement a three-year hiring freeze in an effort to reduce the annual cost of the public sector compensation by over \$2 billion in the third year of this legislation.

(2) We would implement a public sector wage freeze commencing on the anniversary date of all contracts and continue it for the three-year period from that date.

(3) We would establish whistle-blower provisions to protect public servants who report fraud, waste or other abuses in the workplace.

I wanted to say here that a lot of times ministries have money left over at the end of the year, and our year ends March 31. There shouldn't be a rush, as there has been in the past, for ministries to use up their allotment. They should just be more careful and spend what's needed and turn the rest of it back into the treasury.

(4) Establish provisions to discourage government departments from spending their budgets within the fiscal year to eliminate so-called year-end burnoff or face rollbacks, and that's just what I was talking about, that the ministries should be doing that.

(5) Give performance bonuses for public servants based on efficiencies and productivity gains, similar to private sector agreements such as those involving the Canadian Auto Workers union, and establish an expenditure review committee to identify non-productive government programs and to prioritize existing programs.

If these commonsense, fair and effective management principles and measures were adopted, with attrition as their primary management tool, up to \$3 billion could be permanently removed from public sector wage costs over three years.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We're enjoying the member's comments, but I don't believe there's a quorum to hear his comments.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is there a quorum?

**Acting Table Clerk (Mr Franco Carrozza):** Speaker, a quorum, is not present.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Table Clerk:** Speaker, a quorum is present.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Simcoe East has the floor.

**Mr McLean:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It's hard to believe that the time has gone so fast, and here I am only half done my remarks.

I ask this question: Who put us in this dilemma in the first place? That is really the question that needs to be asked.

Well, Bill 48 is a Liberal legacy. Despite the economic boom, the Liberals were spending-crazy during their time in office. They increased expenditures at double the rate of inflation. They increased the debt by \$10 billion and hit Ontario with 33 tax increases to pay their way. The size of the public service increased from 80,000 in March 1985 to 88,000 in March 1990, and I understand that it's up to close to 93,000 today. In the same period of 1985 to 1990, the payroll costs jumped by 60%, from \$2.7 billion to \$4.4 billion.

So the Liberals elevated the expenditure based on an unsustainable level and the social contract fiasco is the end product. The NDP inherited these problems from the Liberals and intensified them by driving up program spending by 12%.

Bill 48 is reactionary and it's panic-stricken and the NDP's last-minute response to the fiscal emergency. Bill 48 is shortsighted. There is no long-term plan to save the taxpayers' money or to permanently reduce Ontario's public sector. What we have always said was, freeze the wages, freeze the civil service, and in three years' time we would save approximately \$4 billion.

The legislation really lays the foundation for a wage catch-up campaign which will start in 1996.

In some of the areas there has been a great concern raised, there have been letters written. My colleague the member for Lanark-Renfrew indicates to me that Patricia Robinson, the mayor of Arnprior, writes: "The social contract is absolutely devastating for our community. Our town is already working with a minimal staff. We do not operate like the provincial government where you have six people doing one job. And now the social contract has forced me to reclaim \$100,000 from our staff budget. We simply cannot cope with the situation the government has created." That's one small municipality.

With regard to the mandatory 12-day unpaid holiday, Mayor Robinson said the following: "To call them 'unpaid' is utterly laughable, especially where this will be applied to our essential services. Police staff will have to be called during these mandatory holiday periods and they will be paid time and a half."

Tom Woodrow from the Orillia police force talked to me on the weekend about this very social contract. He doesn't understand how they're going to fulfil the obligations they have to fulfil in the city of Orillia, and

I can understand that.

The member for Lanark-Renfrew is not speaking tonight so he asked me to make a few comments with regard to his riding for the record so that his people know we are talking about the social contract.

The town of Perth is in an extremely tight fiscal situation. "We have to find a way to make up for the lost \$253,000. We cannot raise taxes or lay off staff, so we are being forced to find other means of cutting back. Unfortunately, important community projects will be scrapped....construction projects are being cancelled and we will not be hiring part-time staff. The social contract has concentrated solely on the provincial side of things, while disregarding the local municipal governments who have to bear the brunt of their decisions."

#### 1920

Where is this money going to come from in the transfer payments that are being cut to the local municipalities? They have their budgetary policies in place. The government says, "Well, they've got seven months left until our fiscal year of March 31." Most municipal governments run on a fiscal year from January 1 to December 31, and that's what they have based their funding on. So where is the money coming from? There's one place, and local municipalities only have one source of income, and that is from the tax base. It's either that or they cut services: cut down on their road work, cut down on their recreation departments. There are many places that they're going to have to cut in order to find the funds that are being taken away.

The Liberals got us into this mess and now they haven't got the decency to help us out. Mike Harris and the PC party have called for expenditure controls and debt reductions. Since 1988, we have been calling for that, since before it was politically correct even to do so. At that time, in 1988, the economy was great. There was nothing but spending taking place.

There were a few other things that happened in about 1988. We had a tire tax. We had a provincial sales tax increase from 7% to 8%. Today we have insurance premiums being taxed. The very government that said, "We're going to have public auto insurance," is now adding 5% to every auto insurance bill we get and 8% for other insurance premiums on top of that, for your household or whatever.

We have the land tax increased substantially. We have the inheritance tax which has increased. We have the conservation tax being taken off the conservation authorities. Where is that funding going to be made up from when the conservation authorities and the municipalities have had shared agreements over the years?

I think we have supplied a responsible opposition to this legislation. We support this legislation in spirit and we want to see the amendments added. We have not just criticized; we have opposed constructively. Our



leader has offered many constructive changes. The six amendments that he has asked are made upon principle. They are made on what we believe to be fair, because we're asking for a wage freeze, we're asking for an employee freeze and we're asking that the government not take away what people have fought for over these many, many years, and that is a collective bargaining agreement. When a collective bargaining agreement is agreed to, that should stay in place, and for this government to even consider breaking that agreement is totally unacceptable.

Somebody said today that if the NDP were in opposition and any other government had done that, they would bring this House down, it would be closed, they would stop anything that's going on in this Legislature. So for this government to be wanting to break contracts that have been negotiated certainly leaves me wondering what will happen next.

There's a letter here from the county of Renfrew:

"While it is clear that compensation does not include overtime, it is not clear to us what share of employees' costs of benefits is to be included in the calculation of compensation. For example, does one include the employer's share of the cost of health benefits, which is OMERS, federal and provincial statutory benefits such as UIC, CPP, WCB, weekend or evening shift bonuses?

"The failsafe measures of Bill 48 require the freezing of compensation from January 14, 1993, to March 31, 1996. In calculating the contributions of this freeze towards the expenditure reduction target, what value is to be placed on withholding cost-of-living increases for the three-year period? No cost-of-living increases have yet been scheduled or negotiated for the period in question."

So they are looking at this in a very, very serious way. What are they going to do with the position they've been put in with regard to Bill 48?

When I look at the powers of the minister in this bill, I have never seen a bill that has been brought in with so many dictatorial powers that the minister has. He can even delegate a power:

"Any power or duty conferred or imposed on the minister under this act may be delegated by the minister to any person designated by the minister and, when purporting to exercise a delegated power or duty, the delegate shall be presumed conclusively to act in accordance with the delegation."

That has been brought out in section 47, under "Delegation of powers." That means that the minister can delegate to any other minister his duties or powers.

A lot of people are listening to the speeches being made, but I'm not so sure they really understand who this social contract affects. The schedule says the public sector in Ontario consists of "the crown in right of Ontario," that's every agency, board or commission;

"the corporation of every municipality in Ontario," that's every local board as defined by the Municipal Affairs Act; "every board as defined in the Education Act," which is the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the Ottawa-Carleton French-language School Board, including its public sector and its Roman Catholic sector; "every university in Ontario and every college of applied arts"; "every hospital listed in the schedule to the classification of hospitals regulation made under the Public Hospitals Act, every private hospital operated under the authority of a licence issued under the Private Hospitals Act and every hospital established or approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council as a community psychiatric hospital under the Community Psychiatric Hospitals Act"; "every corporation with share capital, at least 90% of the issued shares of which are beneficially held by or for an employer or employees described in clauses (a) to (d)"; "every board of health under the Health Protection and Promotion Act"; "the Office of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, the Office of the Assembly, members of the assembly and the offices of persons appointed on an address of the assembly"; and "any authority, board, commission, corporation, office...."

So when they talk about some 900,000 employees with regard to the public sector in Ontario, I'm telling you, that is what it consists of: many of those agencies, boards and commissions.

"For the purposes of this schedule, 'municipality' includes a metropolitan, regional or district municipality and the county of Oxford," and I'm sure most of them read "in the county of Muskoka" as well.

Look at the appendix of this act. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food: the Ontario Food Terminal, the Ontario Stock Yards. The Ministry of the Attorney General: all our legal clinics across this province will be part of this Bill 48. The Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation: the Art Gallery of Ontario, the northern Ontario library, St Clair Parkway Commission. There are all kinds of them in here for which people out there listening don't really understand the implementation of this legislation. They don't. The Ministry of Community and Social Services; all of them are involved.

### 1930

There are many aspects of this legislation which I'm sure would be looked at before implemented. A lot of people consider this legislation to be very seriously flawed. Look at the demonstration that was outside, and people who demonstrated in Gananoque on the weekend—we didn't see them all on TV because they wanted to make sure we didn't see all of them.

**Mr Tilson:** They hid demonstrators from us.

**Mr McLean:** They had demonstrators. There is no shortage of demonstrators.

Our leader hopes the parties can negotiate a contract

without using this legislation. We would hope the government would see fit to take some of the recommendations we have made. The ones I'm mainly interested in have to do with breaking contracts. Anybody in this province who has been involved in negotiations knows that when you fight and bargain long and hard across the table, you feel that when a deal is made and signed, it is secure. We don't feel that any government should come along and take that right away. We feel strongly about that and I, for one, find it very hard for the members in the government to even consider doing such a thing. I just think it's incomprehensible that they would do that.

So we hope that the parties will go back to the table and try, and that the Premier will say that will be one of the issues, that he will say, "Okay, when the contract comes due, that is when it takes effect," and in essence not break them.

I think even the unions understand that a downsizing has to take place. I think they understand that and they know it, so we're not the only ones who are talking about getting back to the table and trying to negotiate a fair deal.

Our leader has urged all parties to the so-called contract talks to build a sign of progress in achieving \$2 billion in savings from Ontario's public sector payroll through negotiation. The prospect of a legislative solution has brought about some serious bargaining, just as we said it would. As Fred Upshaw himself told the *Globe and Mail* last night, "If you don't go to the table and you don't bargain, you suffer the consequences of the legislation." My point exactly, and I hope Mr Upshaw's view will be adopted by the others in the union coalition in the critical days ahead.

At the same time, Mr Harris has stressed that any negotiated short-term concessions must be coupled with measures to ensure the permanent structural downsizing of the public sector. "I will continue to push for clearly articulated PC proposals in both the legislation and any negotiated settlement, mindful that the Ontario taxpayers demand lasting reform of the size and scope of government." That's Mr Harris's goal and he hopes to see it through.

In summing up, I want to say that this has been a concern to me over the past several years with regard to the budgetary policies that have gone on in government. Government should be in the same position as businesses and individuals: You should have to balance your books and you should have to do it periodically to know that you're serious about governing.

You can look across this great country of ours, you can look in pretty near every province we have: Governments have not yet realized that there comes a day when the bill has to be paid. I think there have been a lot of leaders who have made promises and commitments and have been elected because the people felt that they were

going to be given something. Now the day has come, and when we see the film about New Zealand, it certainly brought home to us a lot of the reasons and a lot of the problems that could happen here.

We want to be part of the solution. We don't want to be part of the problem that has existed. Some of the previous administrations, and our own party was one of them, should have talked more seriously about balancing the books. I know. I was part of the government in 1982 when Frank Miller was Treasurer and there were tax increases that he brought in that a lot of people really thought were totally unacceptable. He was trying to keep the deficit down as much as he could, but at that time we were in the downsizing; I know that the Chairman of Management Board, George McCague, cut the civil service from 84,000 to 76,000, and I think that was a step in the right direction. I also remember the Chairman of Management Board saying to each minister, "You shall cut every budget by 5%."

Perhaps we did not go far enough. When the Liberals came to power on June 26, 1985, they went on a spending binge and they went on a hiring binge. In the good times of the 1980s, which we may never see again, there was a great, great expenditure that took place in this province. When we look back today, we often wonder about the ability of governments to control their spending. That day has got to come again.

I like what I'm hearing from my leader, Mike Harris, with regard to taxation, with regard to leading the government, with regard to making sure that, through attrition and not through job loss, we're going to do away with some of the budgetary policies and lower the debt in this province.

When we look at \$10 billion being added to our debt every year, I remember being in this Legislature when our debt was \$19 billion. Today, we will be about \$73 billion. Look at what it takes every day just to pay the interest on that debt. It's a burden on the taxpayers.

*Laughter.*

**Mr McLean:** People may laugh at what I'm talking about, but I think common sense will still prevail. We need leadership that is going to make sure that what we're trying to do here is to get back on the right track. It's not easy. There has been a problem there. It's been there for years. We want to help in this problem, and I hope that in the end we will.

I want the government to look at our amendments and make sure there's a wage freeze and an employee freeze and that the bargaining units that have been put in place will not be interfered with until they run out. Then, at that time, it would be frozen for three years. I think those are commonsense approaches to a very serious piece of legislation.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments?

**Mr White:** I want to commend my friend from



Simcoe East on his excellent speech. I think he very genuinely wants to bring up some means of resolving some of the problems we're faced with, and I think he did so in a very reasoned and articulate way. I would like to comment on a couple of things he mentioned.

The whistle-blowing legislation he mentioned sounds like an excellent idea.

The way the budgetary allotment for departments has traditionally been spent up in the last month of the fiscal year is something our government has stopped, last year and again this year, to make sure that kind of abuse of government budget doesn't occur. It would certainly be an excellent idea to extend that throughout the broader public service, not just with the government itself.

I think he did, however, mix up a couple of things when he was talking about budget savings. I think those points he made in regard to budget savings were important, but there are three aspects to how we're dealing with the deficit. One of course is \$4 billion in expenditure controls, another is the social contract legislation which we're presently debating and the third is the revenue. If there were not a revenue increase, then we would have had to go into a much higher budgetary cut in other areas.

I commend the member for taking honest note of the fact that this is the government that is taking account, taking responsibility for the very difficult situation we're in, not avoiding it and simply passing it on but dealing in a serious and responsible way with these extremely high deficits so that our children will have a future that is not debt-ridden.

1940

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I must say, I am, as they say in French, bouleversé. I'm not quite sure what the correct English translation for this is, but I never thought I'd see the day when a member of the NDP would heap praise on what a Tory has to say. I've been in this place now since 1987, and honestly, I did not believe I would hear all kinds of accolades from the NDP, supposedly the party of the underprivileged and the workers and those who can't fight for their rights, to speak in high praise of the Tories.

What the Tory member for Simcoe East essentially did is point out a lot of very, very serious problems in this legislation. I don't understand, frankly, with all the very serious problems the member for Simcoe East pointed out with this legislation, why he's still going to support it. On any other legislation, the Tories would have said: "We will not support this legislation. This is the responsibility of the government. We are putting forward some ideas, but we're not prepared to support this draconian measure that the NDP, of all parties, is putting forward in front of the public."

While I think the member for Simcoe East has

spoken well—I don't take issue with that, he has spoken well—I don't understand for the life of me the logic in the position of the Tory party. He has gone on for half an hour to indicate the serious problems with this legislation, but despite all the problems he's going to support it.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I'm very pleased to rise and commend the member for Simcoe East who spoke on Bill 48 putting forward such wisdom and good sense, as he always does, good common sense.

The member has diligently and effectively represented the Orillia area and the adjacent rural area around it for now a dozen years. I know he puts forward the views of all his constituents—not just the working people, not just the business people, not just the public servants, but all the constituents of his riding—and works very, very hard in that respect and puts forward and represents the views of all his constituents.

A good part of his riding, as well as Orillia, is the rural area, very similar to the riding I represent, Wellington. One of the inconsistencies in this legislation is the \$30,000 cutoff. The government has indicated that employees of, say, for example, municipalities, who are earning less than \$30,000 annually will not be affected, but if you look at some of those targeted cuts for some of the smaller municipalities in terms of how many employees there are at that smaller municipal office, if you were to apply those cuts equally to the employees, you would find that the employees would end up earning less than \$30,000. That's a discrepancy in the legislation, an inconsistency that would really have to be addressed by this government.

The member for Simcoe East has really done a good job tonight putting forward the views of his constituents, and I want to commend him once again.

**Mr Tilson:** I too would like to congratulate the member for Simcoe East on his usual well-rounded presentation to this House. He certainly has raised the issue that many of us on this side have been concerned with: the simple expression as to what is a social contract, when we see that contract after contract, it's being suggested, is going to be opened up and broken. That's a question we've raised certainly in the Progressive Conservative Party and we're concerned with that.

The other issue we're concerned with, of course, that the member for Simcoe East raised, was the issue of the dictatorial powers that the Treasurer is going to have in this legislation. Even if some of the unions go back to the table and negotiate a contract, the Treasurer may deem that that sector hasn't satisfied the requirements and those who tried to settle may be penalized. A lot of people really won't know what's hit them until it's arrived.

More importantly, I think the member for Simcoe East has raised another issue, which is that this whole

issue of social contract seems to be built around the idea, what's the big union going to do? There are other people in this province who are concerned with the spending that's being taken by all levels of government and they're not all involved with unions. In the small municipalities that the member for Simcoe East represents and which I represent, there are no unions. There's no way in which they can negotiate, and many of them are making less than \$30,000. If the payments to be transferred to the municipalities will be cut, where are they going to cut? Because those employees are exempted for earning less than \$30,000.

So I congratulate the member for Simcoe East for raising issues that perhaps many of the members who come from large urban areas haven't thought of. Certainly, those small municipalities in the country will have to be looked at.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Simcoe East has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr McLean:** I would like to first comment with regard to the member for Nepean's remarks, because I think that is really the reason they are where they are. They brought in the land tax, they increased the provincial sales tax, they brought in a tire tax, they brought in a gas guzzler tax, they brought in the employer health tax. I mean, they brought in 33 taxes, and the problem is that there has been no cooperation between that party and the governing party since it came here due to the fact that they are where they are.

I commend the member for Durham Centre for his remarks and I thank him, because there's got to be a two-way street here. I'm positive. If there's some way we can make legislation better, I'm all for it.

I thank the member for Wellington, and I thank the member for Dufferin-Peel for his comments. On this side, where we are, we have seen in government for many years what it takes to try to be fiscally responsible. We got into some of the tough years, 1981 and 1982, when we were having the downfall in revenue. That's what the member for Durham Centre talked about: revenue. We see that problem in revenue. I can understand the problem the government is having.

I often wonder, instead of raising some of the taxes, especially the sales tax, if maybe they were reduced it would create an incentive for people to go out and buy. I remember that back in about 1982 or 1983 the then Treasurer took the tax off cars, refrigerators and stoves for three or six months. It stimulated the economy. If the Treasurer maybe looked at that aspect, an incentive for people to go out and to purchase and to spend, it might be of benefit for us all.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** I'm pleased to rise today to speak on behalf of Bill 48, the government Social Contract Act. I would like to restate

very clearly, in no uncertain terms, my support for this legislation and the financial and social objectives that lie behind it. I say that because at its heart the social contract aims to protect both government jobs and services now and in the future.

Our government is facing an absolutely unprecedented combination of declining revenues and increasing expenditures. Our total deficit stands at \$68 billion and is growing at the rate of \$1 billion each and every month. This year alone, going on as before, we would add about another \$17 billion to that total. It is not unthinkable that bondholders, whether in New York or Tokyo, could someday be in a position to dictate Ontario's economic and social agenda. I feel strongly that we must act now before someone else acts for us.

That's why we've called all of the players together to try to work out a social contract aimed at preserving jobs for workers and services for the public.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If the Minister of Labour's going to spend half an hour rationalizing this flip-flop, I think there should be a quorum to hear it.

**The Acting Speaker:** I ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Acting Table Clerk:** Speaker, a quorum is not present.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Table Clerk:** Speaker, a quorum is present.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Hamilton East has the floor.

**1950**

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** In return, the government will get some much-needed financial elbow room to ensure that these services will not be threatened in quite the same way again. We have a plan, and we think it can work.

While it may be a difficult concept to grasp in the heat of the moment, the social contract in the long run will strengthen Ontario. Bringing our finances into line will allow us to maintain and build on our achievements in health, education and all the other social services our families depend upon.

Our priorities are growth, maintaining services and putting Ontario back to work. To achieve this, we simply have to ensure that our dollars are going to economic development and training rather than being drained away in debt servicing.

As the Labour minister, I can attest to the stories that cross my desk every day showing how deeply the recession has already affected workers in the private sector. For three years now, private sector businesses have been fighting the recession by downsizing, by trimming operations and by letting workers go. You see that very clearly in almost all of the industrial towns in



the province of Ontario. Many businesses have collapsed, throwing hundreds of thousands of workers on the unemployment rolls, often with very little notice.

I'm proud that in just over the last 18 months, our employee wage protection program has paid out over \$100 million to more than 40,000 workers whose employers owed them money, usually after declaring bankruptcy.

This is the world we live in, and I am sure that members of this House know of friends or family who have been directly affected. Nothing happens in isolation. The economic downturn in the private sector has hampered the government's ability as both an employer and a provider of public services.

That's why I return to the social contract as an ideal way for all of us to share the necessary pain and sacrifice. Let me say frankly that it's an opportunity that many workers who have lost their jobs outright in the private sector over the last few years would have dearly appreciated.

Some critics have claimed that with the Social Contract Act the government is putting the entire burden of deficit reduction on the broader public sector. This is not necessarily the case. The Finance minister's recent budget has already announced plans to reallocate this year, through revenue increases and expenditure controls in the Ontario public service, a total of \$4 billion to deficit reduction. In order to fully meet our financial targets, we need another \$2 billion in cuts from the broader public sector and the Ontario public service. The 950,000 workers in this sector are being asked to shoulder their share of the burden, but certainly no more than that. It bears repeating that the lower-paid workers, under \$30,000, will remain exempt from any compensation adjustments.

The social contract gives us a chance to forge new ground in the way that government and public sector unions work together. It is an opportunity to change the way decisions are made and to improve the way government works, and it could come only from a government that respects working people and the collective bargaining process.

I am proud of what we've been able to do for working people in the course of our first term in office. It's been a progressive agenda. It hasn't been easy, and I don't think it has won us any points on Bay Street, but workers have always had to fight for anything worthwhile. I think we've made great strides in health and safety, labour adjustment, worker training, pay equity legislation and a pay equity down payment program for some of the lowest-paid workers in the broader public sector.

We've reformed the Labour Relations Act, and just last week we introduced a bill to modernize the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, CECBA. We're

taking steps to revive the economy and to put Ontario back to work. We've committed the province to a \$6-billion investment program in infrastructure that will create 60,000 jobs by 1996 and more than 100,000 over the next 10 years. We're moving ahead with a three-year, \$1.2-billion Jobs Ontario Training fund. More than 22,000 people receiving social assistance are now working again, and our overall goal is 100,000 jobs in this category.

Progress for working people has been our government's basic operating assumption since day one. As a former trade union member, I'm used to measuring progress in terms of the material and benefits gains made at the contract table, but progress can also be measured in terms of leadership, and with the social contract process the Premier is asking organized labour in the public sector to assume a leadership role.

Discussion, debate and disagreement are the essence of democracy and, I might say also, of collective bargaining. As the Labour minister, I urge all parties to return to the table with an open mind and to work for a settlement. Let us bargain, let us negotiate, but let us finally do what is right.

Perhaps we should speculate just a moment on what might happen if we fail to reach an agreement, and I think you would agree that it's not a very satisfying prospect. That's why the social contract, to me, is the only preferable alternative.

When we look at what we are spending to pay off the debt we currently have already, more than we're spending on education, and when we look at the fact that, without the actions we're taking, within the next year or two we would be spending more than we're spending on hospitals and some of our health care budget in Ontario on just retiring the debt and that most of it's going out of this country, you soon begin to see that we are heading for the same kind of bind that the federal government is currently in. They're in a position where they're now paying 33 cents of every dollar they raise to finance the debt that has been built up federally, and it's one of the reasons we don't see some of the transfer payments coming to the province of Ontario.

If we were in a position where we controlled that situation and where we had those literally billions of dollars to put into retraining, reinvestment, new programs for workers, we would be doing a heck of a lot more than any hurt we're doing in terms of the situation we're now in.

I must say that I have some difficulty, and I've tried not to be too partisan on this, with members of the Conservative Party in particular. I've always had a bit of respect for them because you always knew where they stood, unlike the Liberal Party in the House, which seems to be all things to all people. But I hear them in this House, on one hand, talking about how horrible it is—this is something new, I must confess, and I think

it has to do with the politics of the situation—to even think of opening a contract, yet at the same time, in the next breath, telling everybody, “You elect us and we’ll get rid of Bill 40; we’ll get rid of CECBA,” the very things that give workers the right to organize and negotiate in the first place. There’s a hypocrisy about that that I find very, very difficult to deal with.

For any of us who came out of the trade union movement, it was not easy, but we had to look at what was the best thing and the fairest thing we could do for people in the province of Ontario, to my mind the only thing that really mattered, what was going to be most helpful to most of the people and most of the workers in the province of Ontario. We could very well have said, “We’re just going to slash the transfer payments and leave it up to workers and the municipalities” and so on to do the negotiating. In my opinion, we would not have come anywhere near fairness for ordinary people than we are doing with the social contract that we’ve put forward for people in the province of Ontario.

I said that what guided me was none of the sacred cows we’ve had in the past, because I don’t think many of them will live much longer, and that goes for some of the sacred cows in the trade union movement as well. It’s simply what is going to work best for most of the people in the province of Ontario, and I saw that the fairest and best way of dealing with those people, the greatest number of people, was for the government to take control of the process of trying to reduce that kind of deficit and make sure we had the fairest reaction to ordinary working people in the province of Ontario.

I had no difficulty making the decisions I’ve made in terms of the social contract process. I think it’s the best thing that could happen in the province of Ontario.

2000

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments?

**Mr Daigeler:** I guess as a theologian I should accept the possibility of the conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus, but frankly I did not think I was going to witness the conversion of Bob on the road to New York, and I think that’s what I’ve seen tonight.

When the member was in opposition I think his seat was somewhere about where I’m standing today, and he said exactly the opposite of what he said tonight. I don’t want to blame him, because a lot of what he said I agree with. Finally, he’s seeing the economic reality, seeing life the way it is out there, and I accept that. But what I would have liked to see from the member for Hamilton East in particular is a little bit of humility, the kind of humility we were expecting from the Prime Minister, Mr Mulroney, that he would have said: “I know that a lot of the things I’m saying tonight, that I’m defending tonight, are not what I said when I was in opposition, not the things I fought so hard for over many years. I have seen, as I’m now in government, that I have a broader responsibility,” as he said, “to the

good of all the people in this province, and therefore I have to take certain steps that force me to bring in this legislation.” I think then I would have said, “Fine, I accept this.” But the way the member has been going on and saying this is the best thing since sliced bread, as though he never had argued the opposite, I find very difficult to take, particularly from the member for Hamilton East.

**Mr Stockwell:** I was simply going to allow these comments by the Minister of Labour to pass. I’m sure he’s had some very gut-wrenching moments going through this piece of legislation, and I understand that, because of the positions he took in his previous some 17 years in opposition, outlined, obviously, by the member for Nepean.

What raised my hackles is that if you’re going to publicly reverse yourself in such a dramatic fashion, as you have done, and you probably more so than anyone, being the critic for Labour, being the Minister of Labour, putting forward positions in opposition that have no relationship to what you’re doing today—look, I don’t have much opposition to what you’re doing today. I believe in reduction and cutbacks and wage reductions and so on in the public sector. I’m a firm believer in that, and I’ve believed in that for my last 10 or 12 years of public life. But I will not take from this member any more lectures on consistency—on labour consistency, on contract consistency, on any consistency—when you have done what you have done over the past three years on a veritable array of issues that you face in government.

From government-run auto insurance to Sunday shopping to your Bill 48, you have absolutely reversed field on every issue you held dear. I accept the fact they have done it in government. I will challenge them occasionally on what they said in opposition. I will challenge them with what they said in the Agenda for People. But for you to have the audacity to stand and lecture anyone in any political field on what their consistent position should be after your escapade here in the last three years is the height of that H-word we’re not allowed to use, Mr Speaker. Mr Minister of Labour, you can go ahead and make your speeches. You have lost any credibility to lecture anybody on consistent political thought.

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** The compliments to the minister were well deserved. He indicated that he’s seen directly on his desk the effects on a lot of people of a number of initiatives. I know he also witnessed on the weekend a number of tombstones that were laid beside the arena, which indicated federal Tory policies which have devastated a lot of our communities.

He talked about some of the concessions that some of the workers are taking. Let’s take a look at Libbey-St Clair glass, where the pensions were locked in till they



are age 65, a 65-cent rollback per hour, and they don't know what the destination of their jobs will ever be. When we talk about the effects of free trade, let's look at Motor Wheel in Chatham, where they were asked for a 50% reduction in their wages with no guarantee of a job. That plant is now closed today.

So there are a number of the issues that the minister talked about, proposals that were going over his desk. I compliment him on one initiative, that he had the ability to bring forward a wage protection program which protected those workers whose employers have run out on them.

But what the minister also indicated are our responsibilities as employers, because I can see the issue where, if we were just to remove the money from the coffers of our transfer partners, the effects that would be there and how the front-line workers would be affected. Yes, it's a very difficult situation to deal with concessions. I've been through it in the early 1980s, in 1981 and 1982, when we dealt with the issues of concessions. Yes, there are those who are going to be affected by a layoff or transfer of jobs, but it is our responsibility, and that's what you see here, a supplementary unemployment benefits fund.

How many collective agreements currently provide for an SUB fund that provides for 95% of the wages? Some of our bargaining in the private sector doesn't even provide for that. A training fund which provides for people to retrain back into the workforce, we don't have that. So what we're doing is acting as a responsible employer, and I think it is very important what the minister has brought across. The effects are there, and I think we better focus this attention more appropriately to federal economic policies called free trade and NAFTA.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** One final participant in questions or comments.

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** There's one thing that I would like to ask the minister, and I couldn't think of a better person to ask than a cabinet minister. There seems to be much confusion in the municipalities and the hospitals and in different areas about that \$30,000 cutoff. Does that mean a \$30,000 salary? If their benefits would include another 20%, 25% or 30%, would they not be eligible on this cutoff? Maybe the minister could explain that to me in his windup remarks.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes questions and/or comments. The honourable Minister of Labour has two minutes in response.

**Mr Arnott:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe in his comments the Minister of Labour used the word "hypocrisy," and I would think he will want to withdraw that statement.

**The Acting Speaker:** That's not a point of order.

The Minister of Labour, two minutes in response.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I just want to say two or three things. I appreciate the comments from the members for Cornwall and Nepean. I heard the arguments they made.

I would say to the member for Nepean that if I had done a sellout, or whatever he's inferring with his comments, it would have come with a lot more pressure before us on Bill 40 when there was a campaign, the like of which I've never seen, to deny workers the right to organize or enable workers to have much more say in the decisions that are affecting them. Whether it's pay equity, whether it's wage protection, whether it's the reform of CECBA that will be before this House very shortly, they are all very indicating, I think, and positive measures that say what we are trying to do is what is in the best interests of workers.

Now, I might say there are some who take a look at Bill 40 and to this day are still screaming about repealing it. They'll want to do a little checking over what's happened in the four and a half months since the bill was put in place, because we are actually getting a fairly good response, including from the business community, in terms of timing, costs, workers' ability to organize. Workers who have taken charge of the ability to try to organize and been fired are back to work within 24 hours in a number of cases. There have been positive results that are not, so far, getting too much anti reaction even from the more hard-line people in the business community, and I think that's important.

Beyond that, I guess you'll forgive me for one little bit of arrogance. All of us are not perfect. I haven't heard the member for Etobicoke West for the last six months in this House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Daigeler:** If I may be permitted to continue a little bit on what the Minister of Labour just said, I respect what he just said and, again, there's a fair amount of it that I agree with. I think he's always been fighting, at least the way I have understood it, since 1987, since I've been here, for the workers to get a fair deal and also to be part of the decisions that shape their own lives. I think in his two-minute rebuttal he was implying that he continues to work towards that goal of involving the workers in management decisions. In fact, that is one of the, I think, indirect goals of this bill that is before us, and there are some difficulties with this, to which I will come a little bit later.

**2010**

But on the principle of involving the workers more over their working lives, I'm in agreement with this principle. In fact, I remember when I first came to this country more than 20 years ago I had a conversation at Carleton University with Angus Reid, the pollster. He at that time was doing his PhD at Carleton University and I was a graduate student there too. We had a very

interesting conversation and I never forgot this, because at the time, when I came over from Europe, from Germany in particular, there was a lot of public discussion about what's called in German *mitbestimmung*, or codetermination.

Frankly, at that time—that was around 1970, 1971—I could not understand why in Canada there didn't seem to be any kind of debate around this very fundamental question that was very much in the forefront of the public debate in Europe. Angus Reid explained to me, as a newcomer at that point, that the Canadian union movement was opposed to this idea of codetermination at that point, that they felt becoming involved in the management decisions was totally blurring—which of course it is—the clear division between management on the one side and labour on the other.

They felt much more comfortable—that's the way Angus Reid explained it to me—having that clear distinction between management and labour and, through the collective bargaining process and in negotiations, they'd want to continue in that way, rather than the European system, which was frankly blurring that clear distinction between management and workers and which expressed itself through the principle of codetermination.

Twenty years later we are, I think, again revisiting this and if I understand the Minister of Labour, with his project of Bill 40, one of his ideas that he was trying to accomplish and which we frankly in this party supported—there are elements in Bill 40 that we support, different from the Tories. We have clearly said we're not simply going to take away the whole of Bill 40; we will only take away those provisions that hurt business.

One of the things that we feel is, in principle, again a good idea is that working together between labour, between the unions and management, sitting down and making—realizing the fact that the decisions that are made in business, the business decisions, are of vital interest to the workers as well and that it's just not good enough to simply give them a wage or a salary and say: "That's it. We on the management side make all the other decisions and you just have to take it and hope for the best."

So this idea of some involvement of the workers in the decisions by business, I think I'm prepared to look at. As I said, I agree with the Minister of Labour on that principle. I'm getting a little bit sidetracked here because that's not really what I wanted to talk about tonight, but since the Minister of Labour brought up this issue, I thought I should put my own view and the view of my party in that regard on the record.

What I did want to say about Bill 48 in particular is about four main points. The first point I want to make is explaining from my perspective how we got into this mess in the first place, and frankly I'm getting a fair number of letters and calls from my constituents who

say, "How did we get there and is it in fact that bad?" That's the first question they ask, "Is it in fact that bad?" Frankly, it is bad, but it isn't quite as bad as the NDP is trying to make it.

Let's not forget that it was at the beginning of April, if I remember correctly—I may be a little bit off in terms of the exact date, so don't hold me to the precise date—that the Treasurer said the deficit was going to come in around \$12 billion, which we in the Liberal opposition, and I think the Tories as well, felt as being way too high. But then I think it was about two weeks later that the Treasurer, all of a sudden, said that instead of \$12 billion it was going to be \$17 billion. He keeps throwing this figure out, I don't know on what basis.

My point here is simply that we have to take, unfortunately, the figures of the Treasurer or the Minister of Finance with a big grain of salt. I must say I like the Minister of Finance. When I was parliamentary assistant of Revenue, Mr Laughren, the Minister of Finance, was the Revenue critic, and I thought we had a decent and reasonable exchange. But the figures that he has been putting forward over the last two and a half years are very, very confusing.

How is it possible that within two weeks a deficit can jump, according to the Treasurer's own statement, from \$12 billion to \$17 billion? But let's face it, this is somewhat of a moot argument, meaning, where does it lead? If \$12 billion is bad, then \$17 billion is even more bad. I won't give an argument on that, because I do agree that even if the deficit projection were only \$12 billion, we still would have to do everything in our power to reduce that deficit figure. I quite agree with the member for Hamilton East that we cannot burden the next government and the next generation with a tremendously heavy debt load where over 20% of every dollar that we earn is going towards the interest payment of the public debt.

How did we then end up at a deficit of at least, let's say, \$12 billion? First of all, in my opinion again, there has been some very poor budgeting on the part of the Minister of Finance. I'm really sorry to say that the member, Mr Laughren, would have done that. He put in some figures that were way too optimistic. He counted on—what was it again? I think it was something like a billion dollars from the federal government in terms of payments for the difficult economic situation, equalization payments, that he was expecting to come to Ontario from the federal government. That clearly was an unreasonable number. He put that into his budget last year to butter his figures, to make them look better.

We told him at that point, "It's reasonable to expect some equalization payments from the federal government, but the figure that you put in is way out of line." That's precisely what happened. The federal government has come through with some equalization payments, but not anywhere near to what the Treasurer had expected



and had put into his budget last year. He also made some assumptions about the economy that, in my opinion and in the opinion of most people, were way too optimistic.

2020

That's one of the reasons that really the budgeting forecasting of the Treasurer has not been very good, certainly last year and not even in the previous year. But, again to be fair in the way I try to be fair, budgeting is always a very difficult undertaking. You are doing forecasting. There's an element of prophesying in this, and to be humble here, we forecast some figures in 1990 that did not quite come true either. I have no qualms in admitting this.

In fact, I was a member in 1989 and 1990 of the finance and economic affairs committee that was studying the budget—it wasn't really studying the budget—that was doing the pre-budget hearings. I remember it very well, when we had all these economic gurus, I can only call them, all the economic experts from the big banks coming to us and giving us their expert opinion as to what the economy was going to look like. Frankly, essentially, they forecast a downturn in economic growth but certainly not anywhere near the way it happened.

Now, mind you, one major factor, of course, that they did not take into their equation and would have totally changed their picture—because the basic assumptions underlying those calculations were wrong—was of course the election of an NDP government. What they didn't count on was that the Liberals would call an election, and that's another matter.

My point is that forecasting is always a difficult discipline, especially if it involves the future, and since it involves the future, by the terminology itself, it is something where you have to use common sense, and that's where, in my opinion, the Treasurer has been lacking: common sense, what some reasonable assumptions are, and go with that and try to be rather pessimistic than too optimistic on your revenue side.

I was listening to some exchange earlier between the member for Willowdale and the member for Oriole which I thought was very, very good and very much to the point. The member for Willowdale, in my opinion, was way off base when he said, and the Tories keep trying to make that argument, that the Liberals left the NDP a \$3.5-billion deficit.

Again, to the credit of the Minister of Finance—I'm trying to look for his riding, and I can't quite think of his riding—the member from Sudbury, in the Sudbury area, to his credit, at the beginning of his term did say that he wasn't blaming the Liberals for the deficit. The recession was coming in, the treasury officials were not able to accurately forecast the situation, and he said—that's the Treasurer speaking; that's not me; that's not the Liberals; that's the NDP Treasurer speaking at

that time—he was not blaming the Liberals for the deficit. It was simply that that's the way it happened with the recession coming in and also with the NDP making certain spending decisions which led to the deficit being \$3.5 billion.

That's precisely the point that the Provincial Auditor in his 1991 annual report made. First of all, he says—and I'm reading here from the 1991 annual report of the Provincial Auditor, so anybody in the public who says, "Well, here's just the self-serving Liberals trying to defend their own record," I invite them to read the annual report of the Provincial Auditor, 1991.

The number's 2.3—that's the number under which he says this: "Ontario has had only one surplus in the last 20 years" and that's the "year ended March 31, 1990." So in 1990 we have had, according to the Provincial Auditor, a surplus, and that surplus, may I remind the members opposite and the members in the third party as well, included the capital budget. That is something very important to remember, because that included almost \$3 billion of expenditures. Capital expenditures are the building of schools and roads and sewer construction. It's those expenditures that this government, the NDP government, is trying to move, and already has moved, off the books of the government. They're not even counting these capital expenditures towards their own deficit. However, in 1990, when there was a surplus, this figure included the capital expenditures.

Then the auditor goes on to say, as I just indicated, that there was, however, as it turned out, for the 1991 budget year, the one that ends March 31, 1991, a deficit of \$3.029 billion. How did this come about? He says, first of all, "the extent of the recession, which was obviously not foreseen at the time of the budget." Again to his credit, the Minister of Finance acknowledged that, and I acknowledge it, that there was an element of the recession that none of us foresaw, that it would happen with that strength and with that speed.

Then there's a second point that we must not forget. The auditor—not me, the auditor—says that special payments were made which were not provided for in the budget. These special payments added to that deficit.

In particular to the member for Willowdale, who's not here at the present time but I hope he's listening in his office or at home on the television, the way I was when he was speaking this afternoon: Of that \$3.5-billion deficit that the member for Willowdale was trying to lump on to the Liberals, almost half of that deficit was deliberate spending decisions by the NDP government, according to the statement by the Provincial Auditor.

I do not argue now and I did not argue then with the right of the democratically elected NDP government to make these spending decisions. They had the right to govern and they said: "We want to take this risk. We want to take these expenditures and we want to incur

that \$3.5-billion deficit at this time." Fine, but don't say that the Liberals left the NDP a \$3.5-billion deficit, because that's simply not true.

I would just simply point out what these special payments were that were made by the NDP government. Again, I'm quoting from the auditor's report, "Special payments aggregating \$924 million were made regarding the Ontario teachers' pension fund." Obviously it's rather ironic that today, almost three years later, we are in a position where the government really has to say, "This was too early that we made that payment and we have to take it back." They also made a \$407-million payment to the Urban Transportation Development Corp and a \$321-million payment to the Stadium Corp of Ontario Ltd. That's the SkyDome.

As I say, the government in its wisdom said, "We want to add these kinds of expenditures at this time to our books and therefore the deficit is \$3.5 billion." Fine, fair, but don't say, "The Liberals left us with \$3.5 billion," because that figure includes very significant expenditure decisions already by the current NDP government.

2030

I haven't gotten very far yet with the comments I wanted to make, but there's one other point I really want to put on the record, because no one else has made it at this point and that point also is a factor in explaining why we are in the situation we're in today.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** Don't go blaming it on Peterson.

**Mr Daigeler:** Just a second. I'm not blaming this on Peterson. I'm blaming this fairly and squarely on the Minister of Finance and fairly and squarely on this government, because it was the first bill that you passed. It was Bill 1. I will read to you what I said on December 5, 1990, in this House.

Bill 1 was the elimination of calculating the provincial sales tax as the bottom-line figure of all taxation. The way it used to be is that you calculated the amount of provincial sales tax that was due at the cash register after the GST had been included in the price. Again to be fair, a lot of my own constituents called me and wrote to me and said: "This is unfair. This is tax on tax." To be honest, it was. I acknowledge that. Calculating the PST on top of the GST is tax on tax. However, clearly the Treasurer, with that measure, which he then withdrew with Bill 1, was forgoing \$500 million in revenue that he could have counted on every year since then.

Nobody has mentioned it so far. I want to put that on the record because I told the Treasurer, on December 5, 1990, "You're being generous with the one hand, but the time will come when you have to take it back with the other hand." Today we see this day.

I want to quote to you what I said on December 5:

"The honourable member for Oxford,"—and by the way, I understand the honourable member for Oxford, Kimble Sutherland, is on his honeymoon. I wish him very well. Across all partisan lines, we certainly hope he and his wife will be blessed with many years of happiness and togetherness and hopefully with many more citizens for Ontario. I won't say any more NDPers—

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Taxpayers.

**Mr Daigeler:** —but many more taxpayers, as the member for St George-St David rightfully says.

Anyway, to get back to the point I'm trying to make: "The honourable member for Oxford is taking great pride,"—because he spoke before I intervened—"in this bill and is talking about the integrity of the government. However, I think, in fairness and in integrity, he should also mention that this bill"—Bill 1—"off the bat, adds \$500 million to the provincial deficit. I respect his decision and I respect the decision of his government and of the Treasurer to do that. He was elected to adjust the budget according to his own wishes, but I think he should not then stand up in this House and say: 'Well, the former government and the bad Liberals left us a big hole in the provincial treasury and therefore we cannot afford to fund universities. We have to charge tuition fees for students.'

"The way the minister seemed to indicate this afternoon in question period, I think he should be up front and say, 'Yes, we deliberately are adding \$500 million to the provincial deficit by taking this measure and that is the decision we have taken.' I think he should mention that to the people of Ontario as well."

That's what I said at the end of 1990. At that time, it appeared very generous and the right thing to do. But frankly, as the Minister of Labour, who spoke earlier, has come to realize, there are some decisions in the life of a government that you have to take that are not very comforting, that don't seem too positive for the public, but in the interest of the long-term fiscal stability of this province they must be taken.

For a Treasurer to just off the bat give up \$500 million, that's a lot of money. As I said, I was parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue just before the government fell and I know that \$500 million in the life of this province is a big amount, and we know that now. Now, just calculate, over the three years of the life of this government, that's almost \$2 billion. That's almost half of the amount that this government is trying now to take back from the public, because it seemed to be so generous in 1990.

I just want to say again that a major reason why we are in the situation that we're in today is the fiscal, frankly, incompetence of this government. They want to do the right thing. I don't want to speak against their motives. I think they want to do the right thing, but



there's also a way to do the right thing and a wrong way to do the right thing.

That's where I so fundamentally disagree with them and that's where we on the Liberal Party side are disagreeing with this particular initiative that is being put forward. We are agreeing that the fiscal situation of this province, the fiscal mess, must be brought into order, but the draconian way that this government is trying to do it is not the way to go, but rather do what the municipalities have requested.

I have only a minute and a half so I cannot really read into the record a letter that I have from the mayor of my own municipality, who wrote to this government on May 25 saying: "These broad-brush solutions made here in Toronto will not work. Give us the opportunity, give us the tools to come to an agreement at the local level."

My leader, Lyn McLeod, has been saying this from day one and my mayor in Nepean has been saying that and frankly the regional chairmen, including the chairman of Ottawa-Carleton, have been saying this and the other chairmen of the regional municipalities as well.

While I agree with the principle of putting this fiscal house into order, I fundamentally disagree with the approach that is being taken by this government. I just would like to say one quick thing. I don't think we should dump over the civil service because the civil service has been providing the services that we the public have been asking them to do and that we the public have been asking government to do.

The Tories always say, "Well, we have to cut government." Let's be realistic. It's not the government that we have to cut, it's the services that we have asked for, which are provided through the government and which cost money, and we have to decide that if we want a reduction of taxes, we also have to have a reduction of services. Since my time has run out, I thank you for the opportunity to participate.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Questions and/or comments? The member for Durham Centre.

**Mr White:** I would like to commend my colleague. He's spoken, however, about \$500 million in revenues, and I think he's spoken quite eloquently and quite honestly, that in fact the Bill 1 of our government was a bill which did not tax a tax, would not have imposed the provincial sales tax upon the GST, that would allow for a future federal government to do away with the GST, that would have allowed the federal government we presently have, had it come to its senses, to do away with that hated tax, and would not mean that we had somehow bought into that tax, that we in any way condoned it.

2040

That \$500 million that my friend mentioned is in fact a tax, the kind of tax that his leader so frequently

opposes, and a tax upon a tax: \$500 million of tax upon tax. That is revenue which we've forgone. It is true that that is the case. But the people who are watching and listening and interested in this debate I'm sure would like to know that had there not been a change of government, they would in fact be paying a tax upon a tax, that \$500 million in extra revenue from a collusion between the former Liberal government and the then and now, but not for long, federal Tory government in imposing upon this province a hated GST, and we would also probably have an extension of that sales tax to other areas.

*Interjection.*

**Mr White:** My friend asks, what's wrong with that? What's wrong with this additional tax upon a tax? I'll tell you. It's an unfair and regressive tax. The measures that we have put in place have for the most part been progressive and based upon the ability of people to pay those taxes, whereas a consumption tax is a tax upon, very often, those who can least afford to pay it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions or comments?

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** I want to commend my colleague from Nepean. I think he gave the fundamental purpose, what we've lived with in this province since September 1990: You give with this hand, and God only knows what day, but maybe tomorrow, you take back with this hand.

We know that the credibility of this government and its ability and sometimes its integrity are being questioned out there. They gave 2% salary increases to the provincial civil servants in January and now, five or six months later, they're asking them for that same money back on which they made commitments, whether it's to buy a house or a car or indeed to provide education for their children. The OMA is in the same boat, except I think more seriously.

They gave a 7% increase in salaries to many of the transfer agencies as late as December 1992, six months ago. How can anyone trust what this government says? It doesn't last even for a year. There is inconsistency, uncertainty, confusion, chaos.

This, I'm sorry to say, in this province is the summer of doubt; it's the summer of fear; it's the summer of uncertainty. It's all of those things for the public sector, but it's also for the many, many transfer agencies, whether they're services in the municipalities, whether they're children's aid societies, whether they're any number of services that people in this province have come to expect.

This government has no plans. They are deferring expenditures, even though they won't admit that, on capital. We all know that, whether it's capital for schools or capital for hospitals. They're talking about deferring payments on unpaid leave for a certain

undefined group of people. That again will be paid by us in two or three years with compounded interest.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? Seeing none, the honourable member for Nepean has two minutes in response.

**Mr Daigeler:** First of all, I'd like to thank the member for Ottawa-Rideau for her comments and for underlining the main point that I was trying to put across and that obviously was so well understood by the member for Ottawa-Rideau, that this government is giving with the one hand and appears to be very generous and very supportive of the underprivileged but, on the other hand, it is taking it back, and taking it back with a vengeance, I would like to say, with this particular bill.

The member for Durham Centre said—and I understand that, you know; it's fair to say—"What's wrong with eliminating a tax on tax?" Well, on principle, it's a great idea. I'm all in favour of that. However, leadership is that with these kinds of generous measures, you don't create a bigger mess, and that's precisely what's happening.

I see the member from Ottawa Centre shaking her head, but she also—and I would have liked to come to that point in my speech still—is very much part of the problem that we have experienced with the legislation that she has introduced with regard to rent controls. What she has done is she has effectively eliminated the small contractors and the workers who are associated with the small contractors with her legislation in this province. That is one of the reasons why these people are no longer paying taxes and that is one of the reasons why they are receiving social assistance.

So what seems to be a great idea on what seems to be a moral principle that I fully support, is being, frankly, abused and distorted by this government. That is my main point, that if you govern, you have to put the long-term issues in perspective. You have to consider what are some of the other factors that enter the greater picture. That's my point that I was trying to make tonight.

**The Acting Speaker:** I want to thank the honourable member for Nepean for his participation and his response. Further debate?

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to say at the top that I will be supporting this legislation on second reading. I will be supporting it because this is probably, of the pieces of legislation this government has introduced, as close to the Conservative philosophy as anything that they have ever introduced. So that's probably why. I will also say this—

**Mr Daigeler:** Okay, that's good. The Tories want to eliminate collective bargaining.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Nepean has had his opportunity. The

member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** Maybe he wasn't happy with his wrapup and he wanted more.

Yes, there is some chaos and concern with respect to this legislation. We are offering, I will be clear off the top, six amendments. If those amendments are not adopted to clarify the problems that we think will be inherent in this legislation, we reserve the right to vote against it on third reading. I think that's a reasonable approach that any government would take: Allow them to take this out to committee, take it out to the people, hear their concerns, register our amendments, and then if they bring them back in a reasonable, coherent fashion, we will support it.

I will also say that this province is in a very, very serious mess financially. Now, every party seems to have a problem with how we arrived at this mess and each party is trying to blame each other for who put us into this mess in the first place. Let me say that the Conservative governments of the last five, maybe 10, years certainly didn't help the situation.

They deficit-financed when they didn't need to deficit-finance. They spent money when they didn't need to spend money. They introduced programs that I think were not properly before government, and I think it was one of the major reasons why that government under Bill Davis, and subsequently under Frank Miller, was defeated. The legacy that they left, I thought, was 43 years of a well-managed province, but as to the length of time that they were in government, I don't think they were as well managed as they were in the first number of years.

Now the Liberals are going to suggest, as was suggested a number of times by the previous speaker, that really they managed a booming economy and they had a lot of money rolling in and, yes, they spent the money but they had it and they didn't run up the debt. But history will prove them wrong. They accumulated some \$8 billion to \$10 billion in new debt during the greatest period of growth this province has ever seen. So I think there is maybe significantly more blame for that Liberal administration than the previous Conservative one, and maybe there isn't. Maybe there's a debate there that they're equally to blame.

This government, in my opinion, really, really messed things up in that first budget. I was sitting in this same seat when this first budget was announced and I could not believe, I was absolutely astounded at, the deficit figure that this government projected: \$10 billion. Ultimately, it came in at about \$13 billion.

At the time I thought, "This is nuts. This is crazy." But they did have their defenders. The Solicitor General—I think he has another title, the Correctional Services minister. I remember going on a couple of TV debates with him and I think he honestly believed, as



this caucus probably honestly believed, that they were doing the right thing. I remember he explained all the programs that they instituted and how the \$10 billion wasn't really a lot. I said at the time it was more like \$13 billion, and he said, "Oh no, it's \$10 billion."

But I think you honestly believed that you were doing the right thing. You were truly socialists. I measured you as socialists. You were the socialists that I'd come to know: big spenders, a lot of programs, little fiscal control. I don't think you can debate that. The deficit that you brought in, some \$13 billion, was horrendous, was unbelievably high.

2050

What astounded me, though, was your settlement packages to the workers, because you had admittedly said—again, in this debate we had on TV, cable 10—that you were in a recession. I understood your deficit figure, but for the life of me, I couldn't understand the package you put together for the public service employees.

It was 13% or 14%. You say: "Well, there are new employees in there, pay equity and so on and so on. We only gave them a 6% increase." But even so, I thought, "If you really believe we're in a recession and you really think this deficit is too high, even marginally too high, why are you settling at such huge numbers for your employees?" I never really got a good answer. It wasn't like anyone else was getting 6% increases and it wasn't like anyone else's payroll was increasing by 13% or 14%, except your government's.

So we moved on to the next year's budget. At the time, I remember your spin line was "We're fighting the recession, not the deficit," and you all stood up and cheered Mr Laughren when he said that. I myself was falling out of my chair.

With the next budget you came in and tried to smoke and mirror this deficit. You moved things around and offset some payments that you had to make, the teachers' pension fund, and you claimed the federal government was going to give you \$1.2 billion. You did a whole bunch of things, but your deficit was still high.

What astounded me was that here we were in one of the most depressive recessions we'd seen since who knows when, and again, across the board, en masse, you increased the public service payroll. You negotiated settlements at 2%, 3%, 4%, 5%, and you increased the payroll across the board. I thought, "If this is such a horrendous recession, why do you keep giving your employees these kinds of raises?" We in this party were telling you, "The private sector is laying off," and this government was increasing the payroll and broadening the size of the public service. It really astounded me, because I thought if you truly felt this was an incredibly difficult recession, why were you exacerbating the problems, paying people who had reasonably secure jobs at reasonably high wages, to tax people who were

fundamentally out of work?

I am not shocked that we're at this stage today. I admit that I am absolutely shocked that this government is going about it the way it's going about it. I must admit, in all my years of listening to the NDP academics at the universities downtown and the suburban NDP who were used to the NDP style of checked jackets and elbow pads and the rural NDP and the unionized NDP, en masse, I honestly never thought I'd see you sit in unison, minus a couple of dissenters you don't buy into any more—I never thought I'd see you sit around passing this kind of legislation.

I know it has got to hurt to the core of your bones. It must bother you like nothing has ever bothered you to introduce Bill 48, because Bill 48 does exactly what you've opposed and stood against probably your entire political careers and that you've stood against as a party in the history of your political party. But it's here and it must be dealt with, because we are in a financial mess, due in part to us, the Conservatives, those Liberals and really exacerbated by you, the NDP.

I said earlier that I believe in collective agreements and I believe in contracts. I believe wholeheartedly that if you sign a contract, you should live up to it. I also believe that if a private company signs a contract, it should live up to that contract unless the employees agree to negotiate that away. You see, you have one power that a private company doesn't have: You can change the law. No private company can change the law; you can change the law. This is the fundamental difference between what you're doing and what any private sector company could do: They couldn't change the law. You know Bill 48 is doing that. You're changing the law.

I'm a believer in the bang, bang, bang scenario. I believe in it because I want to see this reduction take place with the smallest pain and suffering upon all people who provide—and not only the providers, but those who take advantage of—public services. So why do I believe in the bang, bang theory? Because it's clean, it's fair and it's quick. And you know what? Everybody understands the rules.

If I were in the situation that this government is in and I had negotiated wage settlements over the past three years that added up to double-digit increases—10%, 12%, 13%—to the payroll of the public sector, 20% to the payroll, I would simply introduce legislation to roll back everyone's wage by 5%, case closed, done.

I know that the unions wouldn't like it and I know that if you were in opposition you'd be having an absolute hairy fit if anyone ever suggested we should roll back wages by 5%, but you know why I would do it? Because it's tough, fair and reasonable leadership in very tough and unfair economic times. I have difficulty with your legislation because it's patently unfair, it's going to be nearly impossible to administer and people

are going to take advantage of situations within the legislation who shouldn't be taking advantage of situations.

I make two quick points about your legislation and ask you, do you think this is fair? Do you think that some people should be giving up 5% of their wages over the next three years with pay pause days while others give up nothing? That's what your legislation will do, because I'll tell you right now, the policeman in Metropolitan Toronto or the day care worker in Scarborough or the attendant in a home for aged facility in Etobicoke won't be taking their pay pause day. They'll be banking their pay pause day. They'll be banking their pay pause day because in 1996 this thing lifts, and all those people who had to take a pay pause or a 5% reduction in their salary will have taken it except those people who are in mandated services. They'll have banked 36 days, and in 1996 they're going to say to the municipal government where they work, "You can either give me 36 days off, a month and a half, or you can pay me." And you know full well that municipalities are going to pay them, because they won't be able to afford to give every cop in Metropolitan Toronto an extra month and a half holidays in one year.

Do you think that's fair, that a cop making \$50,000, \$60,000 a year actually gets no reduction while a secretary who's making \$25,000 or \$32,000 gets a 5% reduction? It's not fair. It's not sharing the pain. It's not what you're trying to achieve with this legislation. It's unmanageable: It's impossible to implement on a broad-sector, fair basis. That's what makes it so wrong, that's what makes it so unreasonable and that's why people don't understand it.

You know what else I don't understand? I don't understand how you can take someone's legal rights away from them at any time. Many have suggested the War Measures Act. I don't think it's as draconian as the War Measures Act, but I don't understand how any government could say that if someone gets fired wrongfully they don't have any right to appeal that firing. That's not right, that's not democratic, and that doesn't happen in free countries.

If you get wrongfully dismissed, you have a right to appeal, a right to be heard; you have an opportunity to say, "I was wrongfully dismissed and my employer was wrong." That's what's wrong with your legislation, because you've taken those rights away from people, democratic, fundamental rights, all in the name of a social contract, all because you didn't want to say that everybody gets a 5% wage cut.

2100

I don't understand that. If you're going to reopen 8,000 or 9,000 collective agreements and you're going to try and work in a pay pause day that's going to cause havoc in a lot of municipalities, if you're going to tell

some people they're going to have to give up the 5% while you're going to tell others they get to save their holidays for 36 months, if you're going to tell some that they have to take a 5% reduction, why don't you just tell everybody they get a 5% reduction? There's no service lost, there's no pain on the municipalities and everybody knows what's going on.

This is what I don't understand about your government. I understand that you want to negotiate with the unions, but I don't know why you think unions are going to come in and negotiate wages and packages away. That's not their mandate. They've got a constituency just like you. I've negotiated with unions. Their constituency is the dues payers, the people who pay their salaries, the members. Members don't let their executives go into negotiations and negotiate away pay and benefits; it's not in the cards. So it's going to be tough to get agreement.

Another thing I don't understand is, why did this just hit you? I can't honestly believe that one night Bob Rae was sitting at home watching W5 and saw the New Zealand story. I can't believe that's it.

This government has spent a significant number of weeks spinning its wheels. Some will say, "We had a full and frank and open discussion on negotiations." Yes, maybe you did, but you still spun your wheels because you're no further ahead today than you were when this was thought up some four or five months ago. People still don't know what the effect on their lives is going to be.

You want to know one of the other things that I don't understand? If you're so concerned about workers who work for governments in this province, why will you allow municipalities to lay them off when all you have to do is give everybody a 5% decrease? What benefit is it to see government employees, during the worst recession since the Depression, line up in UI lines after a year? Where's the benefit? I don't understand that, when all sharing the pain means is that everybody takes a 5% cut. Where's the benefit?

I support this. I support this because something like this needs to be done. But I honestly don't understand, in a social democratic, union-based government, who thought this up and who considered this to be reasonable and fair for both the constituents in the province of Ontario and the employees.

They suggest sometimes that Conservatives are draconian and not into negotiations, that they don't care about certain employees and don't have a caring, compassionate attitude to the people of this province. I disagree. With the great pains you took to try to prove your fairness and equitable relationships with the people who work in this province, you've done them a disservice. You've done them a great disservice: They are standing out there today in absolute and utter disbelief because they don't know what's going on.



If you want to know the most secure thing that people working in government could have today, the most secure thing you could tell them, the most gratifying thing they would like to hear from a government, it is, "Tomorrow you're going to have your job and you're going to get a 5% reduction."

You know something? I don't care what that gentleman who heads up the union, Mr Sid Ryan, or Mr Upshaw or Liz Barkley say. In my mind, they don't speak for the union rank and file, because the union rank and file is saying to me in my constituency office, "I just want to know if I have a job."

If you told them they had a job and told them, "We're just going to take 5% for three years" or whatever, and gave them the security of knowing they'll make their mortgage payment next month, they'd stand and applaud you rather than fight with you in the streets of this province today.

But no, we've got to have a social contract. We've got to have a social contract to throw people's lives in a spin; we've got to have a social contract to throw the municipal world in a spin; we have to have a social contract to close down emergency wards at Mount Sinai; we have to have a social contract to throw people's lives in this province into absolute chaos with a contract that I don't think is implementable, because nobody in this province has got the guts to stand up and say, "Real leadership means a 5% rollback for everybody." That's why we have to have a social contract and that's what this government isn't doing.

I don't know how they agreed to reopen 9,000 contracts. I don't know who talked them into pay pause days. I don't know who the guy is who told you that you can call it fail-safe mechanisms and compensation reviews. But you know something folks? You're listening to too many academics, you're listening to too many upper echelon bureaucrats, you're listening to too many consultants. You've stopped listening to the people, and the people aren't saying that.

The people are saying, "I can't pay my taxes." The people are saying, "I can't find a job." The people are saying, "Fix this economy." They're not telling me to go to the Legislature in Toronto, Ontario, and argue through July about some social contract that, at the end of the day in 1996, will save practically nothing except a bunch of holidays for a bunch of civil servants. That's not what they're asking me to do. And they're not asking me to take some more time to meet with Sid Ryan, Liz Barkley and Fred Upshaw, because you know what? They don't care what they have to say either. Those are the people who pay my dues, those are my constituents, those are my union people. They're called the taxpayers and they don't want to hear from them any more either.

In closing, I would ask this government to do one thing. I have one amendment and this is my amend-

ment. I don't speak for my caucus, I don't speak for anyone else but me. I would support an across-the-board 5% rollback on everybody: on you, on me, on teachers, on policemen, on firefighters, on day care workers, on everybody. If you've got a floor where you want to go below \$25,000, pick the floor, but I would support it. I would support it because it's fair, it's equitable, it's implementable, it's reasonable and it shows leadership.

If you really have a problem, go to the people and be honest, be up front and tell them the truth: "We're broke, we're going into debt, we can't sell our bonds, and unless we tighten our belts, we are going to go broke. Everybody's got to take a 5%." They'd take it, they'd accept it, and in 10, 15, or 20 years, when all this gets sorted out, they'd thank you for it. But sometimes leadership doesn't turn on a day. It won't turn on a week and it won't turn on the next election. Sometimes, you just have to do what's good for the people and hope that the electorate understands, the message is heard and the votes are cast.

**Mrs O'Neill:** I'm somewhat confused by the statement of the member for Etobicoke West when he says he's supporting the legislation, because I was having a lot of trouble finding even one phrase let alone a sentence in his speech that stated that. In any case, I want to agree with him and congratulate him for picking up the words that are now being slipped into the Ontario vocabulary, words that no one knows the meaning of: "pay pause," "fail safe"—what does that mean?—"social contract," "compensation reviews." Those things do not mean what they have normally meant when people spoke.

**2110**

The grievance procedure that he pointed to I find extremely offensive in Bill 48. Anybody who has ever suffered either unjust or unfair dismissal, and in many cases had to go to court to prove their case, is going to have to find out that this legislation will never protect them again. They will have lost that protection. I cannot believe that an NDP government would even think of that, let alone write it down.

Collective bargaining has always been based, its history is, on clarity, on continuity and on trust. There isn't one ounce of that in Bill 48 and whatever will fall out of Bill 48.

The NDP government, as the member for Etobicoke West has stated, has been spinning its wheels in this whole mess now for days, weeks and months. They have created a dust-storm in this province and the province has been left spinning in the dust-storm.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions or comments. The honourable member for Simcoe East.

**Mr McLean:** I just want to take the two minutes allotted to me to say a few remarks with regard to the member for Etobicoke West's statement, and I want to

pick up on one of the very strong points that he made. It's what I've been hearing too in my constituency. If you treat everybody equally and fairly, if you take 5% of everyone, they would be satisfied; and I think that is a point that's really worth discussing, because when I have had teachers, I have had policemen, I have had people who have worked in the society, with regard to the 5% there's nobody who is opposed if everybody is being treated equally.

But that is not what's in the legislation, and as I said earlier on this evening when I had spoken with regard to the contracts, that is one of the very issues that's the most disturbing to most people. It's disturbing to me and it's disturbing to the people who have negotiated a contract, who have a contract that they have signed. They have sat across the table from management and with their union leaders and they have negotiated a contract. I find it very unacceptable that this government would bring in this type of legislation that would do away with a contract that has been signed.

As I had said earlier, if this government was in opposition and any other government was in power, they would close this Legislature down because of that very issue alone. What our leader is saying is that we freeze the wages, we freeze the size of the civil servants and in that way you would get a \$4-billion saving in three years.

The member who has just spoken has given you many reasons why this contract is not right, but we want to make some amendments that would make it right, and I congratulate him for speaking with regard to the 5% reduction that everybody in society would be happy to take.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments.

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I'd like to congratulate my colleague from Etobicoke West. As always, I think he's made some extremely valid points. I think he's indicated what all of us have certainly heard from our constituents. I can certainly tell you that my constituents, my teachers at home have indicated to me, and the civil servants that I have spoken to as well, would be quite happy to take a wage cut of 5%. In fact, some of them have even indicated they would be willing to take a wage cut of 10%.

I think what's causing the problems throughout this province is the uncertainty that this legislation has created, and there was the hope that this would be resolved mid-June. That hasn't happened. The uncertainty now is going to continue until at least August 1, and it's absolutely regrettable that this Premier and this government has created this type of situation.

Having bargained, myself, in good faith with unions in the past, I'm very, very surprised that this government is willing to gut the negotiated contracts that have

been established, and it's certainly not something that I can support.

I hope the members across will give very serious consideration to the amendments that have been put forward by our leader—the wage freeze—and I think we need to give some consideration to the proposal from the member for Etobicoke West when he refers to the need for fairness, that everyone would indeed have a 5% reduction.

I think we need to settle this issue as quickly as we can. We need to end the uncertainty and we need to start putting in place some measures which are going to create confidence in this province. This government has done absolutely nothing to restore confidence. We don't see job creation; we don't see new investment. It's time to deal with this issue and get on and create jobs for our students and others in the province.

**The Acting Speaker:** We can accommodate one final participant. Seeing none, the honourable member for Etobicoke West has two minutes in response.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, I didn't make my four, so it must have been a bad speech.

I would say to the members for Simcoe East and Waterloo, I thank you for your comments. I gave great thought to that 5% scenario and I think it's probably, compared to what we have before us, a far better solution.

The member for Ottawa-Rideau, I understand what you're saying. You didn't hear a lot of good things about this particular Bill 48 in my comments. As the Premier likes to say, I'll be very direct with you. I think it's better than nothing. I fundamentally believe that it's better than nothing.

Something has to be done. We're on a freight train that's going the wrong way fast. I don't think it's the greatest piece of legislation. In fact, it may even be the worst piece of legislation, but I think it's something that has to be done.

I say to the member from Hamilton, who hasn't listened in six months, I would ask you to listen for one minute and take this bit of information back to your cabinet. If you want to be fair to the people in this province, and reasonable, why don't you take the 5% solution back to your cabinet? It's quick—

**Mrs Witmer:** Hamilton East.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm sorry, Hamilton East. Was it Hamilton Mountain I said?

**Mrs Witmer:** Hamilton East, yes.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Hamilton East.

**Interjection:** The Minister of Labour.

**Mr Stockwell:** The Minister of Labour. It would be far better to take this 5% solution back, because I think you would probably serve the people of the province far better, you'd serve the employees far better and you'd



put certainty back into lives that are in a very uncertain situation.

If the members opposite don't want to listen to that solution, I'll say this: Three years out in your social contract in 1996, you'll have realized very minimal savings and you'll have taken a lot of pain for very little gain. When you get down to the bottom line, folks, if you're going to go through this pain and change your principles this much, you may as well get something for it.

**The Acting Speaker:** I want to thank the honourable member for his participation and his response. Further debate.

**Mr D. James Henderson (Etobicoke-Humber):** The first thing I want to say is that the chickens have come home to roost.

When this government brought in its first budget in 1991, promising to spend its way out of a recession, we saw storm clouds, we heard the hurricane warnings and we knew we were headed for trouble. That economic reasoning would have been laughable had it not been so tragic. It makes about as much sense as a destitute family thinking that by borrowing money from the bank and spending it all, they will somehow rescue themselves from their financial problems. That doesn't work for families and, not surprisingly, it doesn't work for governments. You can't spend your way out of financial problems.

What you will do, if you try, is gather a huge debt which will burden that family or that government for many years to come, perhaps to a time when its capacity to pay it off will be very, very limited. That is what the New Democrats have done, and that is why they are choosing now to take draconian action to take this lurching ship and get it back on some kind of navigable course. The important thing to emphasize here is that the draconian action is necessary at least in part because of the very bad economic course the government charted in 1990 and 1991 when it promised to spend its way out of a recession.

I think the government is right in feeling that tough economic measures are necessary now. But they might not be, or at least they might be much less draconian than is necessary now if the economic management of the province had been competent in 1990 and 1991.

The government can't get off the hook by saying that this is a drastic solution for a drastic problem, because the hook is one fashioned and the problem is one created by the very government that pleads its innocence. This is a draconian bill to correct a self-made problem.

2120

In medicine we have a word, "iatrogenic," to refer to illnesses that are caused by the physician. We need a similar word in the lexicon of elected assemblies.

Ontario's fiscal woes are gubernogenic. Bob Rae and Floyd Laughren, the fiscal physicians of the province are administering shock treatments to correct a gubernogenic illness afflicting their collective patient, and they're not very good doctors. I worry especially about those new measures the Minister of Health has brought in to expand her powers if indeed her tutors are these two physicians, the Premier and the Minister of Health.

The history of all this, by now, is very familiar to us. In March, the government proclaimed its intention to negotiate a social contract—a euphemism for a wage rollback—to reorganize the public sector and save money, warning of a \$17-billion deficit if it failed to act. Seventeen billion dollars, \$1,700 per man, woman and child in the province of Ontario: A newborn baby, born into this province of Ontario is born into a \$1,700 debt.

In April, the unions made it clear that they would have no part of sector-by-sector bargaining until the government set out more specifics, and not surprisingly, the government makes very little mention now of the collapse of British Columbia's social contract which had been held out as a model for the province of Ontario.

Public sector unions announced a boycott of the social contract talks while they drafted some counterproposals of their own. About that time, the federal NDP Finance critic got kicked out of his portfolio for criticising this social contract concept; so much for socialist democracy in action. Yet somehow, despite this lurching start, the government's chief negotiator managed to describe the beginnings as very positive, which is a bit like Julius Caesar telling Brutus that his trip to the forum that day had been a very positive experience.

In May, union denunciations of the social contract talks grew more strident. As the government's chief negotiator announced his conviction that agreement could be reached, the Ontario president of CUPE promised to "take this government down." Somehow, one feels that they were not seeing eye to eye, this chief negotiator for the NDP and the Ontario president of CUPE. One began to suspect that Julius Caesar and Brutus weren't so much in agreement after all.

The social contract talks descended into chaos and the government began to flounder as the president of OPSEU told his troops to prepare for a general strike. Yet the government's chief negotiator, irrepressible gentleman that he is, pronounced then, "We can almost see a deal." Brave words, "We thought we saw light at the end of the tunnel." It turned out we saw only more tunnels at the end of the light. Brutus and Caesar were in complete agreement, except that each was planning to destroy the other.

In June, somehow suspecting that all might not be well, the government lowered its social contract savings target from \$2 billion to a little over \$1.5 million and

started talking more generally and more diffusely about such diluted and face saving notions as savings in pension costs, increased unemployment insurance benefits—payable, God only knows how—extended notice periods, retraining funds of unclear origin, and bribes to public sector health workers to eliminate competition from the private health care sector.

Not surprisingly, the unions abandoned the social contract talks in early June. The Premier held a press conference to slam the public sector union leaders for their rhetoric, and incidentally, bump the social contract savings target back up to \$2 billion. After all was said and done, somehow much more had been said than done.

Somehow, one suspects that Stephen Lewis' comment that the social contract "was conceived in haste and... shabbily executed" was painfully close to the mark. Stephen Lewis was of course not the first, nor only, nor even the loudest New Democrat to raise questions.

So here we are, after the Canadian dollar has dropped in value and the Bank of Canada rate has climbed a little, with the Social Contract Act which sets out a complicated, layered system of negotiations to be completed by August 1. If that deadline is not reached, provisions will be imposed on employees to freeze their wages for three years and require 12 unpaid leave days each year in what the government calls fail-safe provisions: yet another euphemism, *c.a.e.* suspects. About that time, the first NDP cabinet minister, not surprisingly, bailed out and resigned her portfolio.

There is no doubt, and the government is right in this, that tough fiscal measures are required, but the people of Ontario are rightfully very unhappy.

The city of Etobicoke, where my constituency is located, will have to cough up nearly \$4 million for its share of the social contract burden. Etobicoke city manager David Deaves laments that Etobicoke won't have time to reach the figure through payroll deductions and says Etobicoke will have to find some portion of the nearly \$4 million from other sources. Etobicoke is already dealing with a reduction in transfer payments of nearly \$1 million, as well as an increase of \$200,000 in benefits taxes. By the time the province's austerity program ends in three years, Etobicoke will have shelled out more than \$15 million.

Where will that come from? Let's not forget that whether we are talking about federal revenues, provincial revenues or municipal revenues, the revenue-payer, the same taxpayer is going to pay the bill. It doesn't matter whether it's provincial or federal or municipal, the buck stops with the payer of taxes.

Peter Leiss, president of the union which represents Etobicoke's outside workers, says his members feel betrayed. The cornerstone of the NDP's labour platform has always been the right to free collective bargaining.

Clearly, collective bargaining under this government proceeds, right now at least, under a sword of Damocles, governed by an hourglass which expires on August 1. The message is, "Kowtow by August 1 or the sword is surely going to fall."

Jim Robertson, the president of the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation, Etobicoke District, claims the government is doing what it wants and leaving others to shoulder the responsibility. Robertson says that this NDP government has done away with the entire negotiating process and seems to dismiss the idea of future bargaining sessions as a futile notion.

I am in favour of tough economic measures, as are my colleagues, and there may even be times when checks and balances are necessary on the collective bargaining process, but the government has set forth an unworkable set of measures which are causing chaos in Ontario. However much we may applaud fiscal restraint, and most of us do, we are getting too little of it too late and the result may be catastrophic for Ontarians, and especially for labour-management relations in Ontario, for many years to come.

Metropolitan Toronto, not surprisingly, echoes these Etobicoke concerns. Metro observes that for years Metro has received no operating money from the province for its education system, and now under section 35 of this legislation the government can even require a reverse payment, a negative grant, paid from Metro to the province. What will happen to service levels given growing enrolment demands when that comes to pass?

Metro Chairman Alan Tonks predicts the destruction of Metro because the social contract will snatch nearly \$70 million from the Metro government. Tonks calls the social contract "an act of hysteria on the part of the province" and insists that the government fails to recognize the harm that it is inflicting. "Forgive them, it seems to me," he says, "for they know not what they do." He calls the social contract a "desperate and frantic act."

#### 2130

Furthermore, here is what citizens of Metro can expect as a result of the impact of the social contract legislation on Metropolitan Toronto: longer waits for ambulances, fewer police officers on the streets, fewer homes for the aged, the gutting of transit services. These are essential services. Could we not have acted so as to avoid this kind of cost-crunch, and now that it is upon us, partly at least because of the dismal economic strategy charted by this government, is this the best approach to correcting the disaster?

This constitutes an enormous economic turnabout in a jurisdiction which used to be the envy of the world. Of the \$275 million that Queen's Park is going to snatch from Ontario municipalities, something close to half is going to come from Metro.



As the Etobicoke Guardian editorialized on June 16: "The NDP has to take responsibility for the solutions it is proposing, and by downloading to lower-tiered employers like the city of Etobicoke and constantly delaying any decisive action, they're making the \$2 billion harder and harder to achieve. The process is...eroding what is already an all-time low in morale in Ontario," and a province which has reached an all-time low in morale will be a difficult jurisdiction indeed in which to impose the kind of fiscal restraint that now seems necessary.

It seems to me that to those NDP hopefuls who aspired to sit around the cabinet table and felt left out when the Premier shuffled his cabinet just a few months ago, we can say: "Take heart. In the fullness of time, it will become apparent that being left out of this layer-caked cabinet is by far the greater honour."

I am reluctant to close without finding some little positive thing to say about this government in what must surely be to date its darkest hour. Well, we can give it marks for bravery. The government proclaims that "everyone—the government, employers, bargaining agents—is committed to ensuring the impact of the fiscal reductions is distributed fairly." These must surely be brave words, if perhaps a little optimistic.

Brave words of feigned goodwill from a government that is legislating a sweeping pay freeze. Brave words of feigned goodwill from a government that is slashing its pension contributions. Brave words of feigned goodwill from a government that demands that public sector workers take time off without pay, that public sector workers accept a legislated layoff. Brave words of feigned goodwill from a government that is ripping up negotiated contract settlements in favour of draconian anti-people legislation.

Just in case the people of Ontario refuse to cooperate with sweeping pay freezes, slashing of government pension contributions, legislated layoffs, the so-called fail-safe provisions of this act, those provisions give employers the right to send the people home without pay until cost reduction targets are achieved.

Wouldn't it have been better if government had listened in 1991 to its critics from the loyal opposition who pointed out the obvious, that you can't spend your way out of a recession, that you can't spend your way out of not having enough money? Was the message so very complicated then? You don't have to be a financial wizard to know that having no money is not a reason to spend a lot of money. What kind of verbal sleight of hand is at work in telling the people of Ontario that somehow a spending spree is good treatment for indebtedness and insolvency?

I expect to vote against this social contract legislation, not because we don't believe that fiscal restraint and perhaps tough fiscal measures are now necessary, because they are, but because we believe that the

specifics of this bill, the specific measures put forward to achieve the necessary savings, are unworkable.

We think the people of Ontario might be willing to forgive the government if it would own up to its mistakes. We think that the kind of fiscal belt-tightening that is going to be required would be easier to achieve if the government would come clean with the people of Ontario and say that it goofed back in 1991 and that free-wheeling spending was not, indeed, the solution to Ontario's economic woes.

We think this legislation is unworkable and we do not believe that it will achieve the targeted \$2 billion in savings. We think this bill is deeply flawed. The deferred leave provision means that up to 36 days in paid vacation will be owed to an unknown quantity of workers with, in effect, simply a deferral of costs until 1996.

We think this bill undermines the philosophy of local bargaining and imposes unrealistic time lines for reaching agreement. We think the worker redeployment scheme is going to be impossible to implement and we worry about the absence of an exit strategy.

After three years of draconian, imposed curtailment, expectations from the people of Ontario are going to be very high. That legacy will be a tough one for the Queen's Park government of 1996.

Let's applaud the philosophy of this bill and agree that tough fiscal measures are going to be required. Once this bill is disposed of, and hopefully rejected by this Legislature, let's come clean with the people of Ontario and acknowledge that the NDP's fiscal management in 1991 was a mistake. Let's come clean and ask the people of Ontario to work with us to get this ship back on course.

Let's talk about getting our own house in order as a first step. Let's eliminate waste and duplication in government services. Let's draw up programs to get our young people back to work, and let's devise the kind of fiscal measures that will lead to business prosperity in the province of Ontario.

Ontarians are reasonable people. They know that a fiscal crisis is upon us. I think they are willing to tighten their belts and take the steps towards fiscal responsibility, fiscal prudence, fiscal restraint that must be taken. Let's show them a little integrity in government and let's get realistic in what we plan to do to meet the challenges of Ontario's current fiscal woes. Ontarians deserve no less.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Questions and/or comments?

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** I won't take all that much time to respond to the member for Etobicoke-Humber, because some of his final remarks are really what triggered my desire to say a few words.

The final offer for the social contract included what

I think are some highly innovative initiatives, one of which relates to workplace efficiency measures, which have committees at the work site to work—labour and management together—to deal with the issue of waste. It seems that the member has not noticed this when he read the final offer. I would hope that he would take the opportunity to look through the final documents from the negotiations and understand that it is the commitment of this government to eliminate waste and to really include workers in that process.

As someone who worked in the public sector for many years and felt that I had a contribution to make to my management in how it ran the St Catharines Public Library, and as someone who had 13 years' seniority in that workplace, I was fairly sure I understood a lot of, shall we say, the expenditures that had to be made.

I know that workers out there in the public sector are very keen to participate in that kind of discussion. I've had OPSEU workers in my office, specifically, who are very concerned about some of the spending decisions that are made in London on behalf of an office in St Catharines. I know they can do it a whole lot better and I'm happy for their involvement in those kinds of discussions.

2140

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** I want to rise and comment on the thoughtful speech made by our colleague the member for Etobicoke-Humber and perhaps to note, for a number of members who were new to this House after the 1990 election, that the honourable member has demonstrated in his years in this House a great deal of courage in the expression of opinions on key pieces of government business legislation.

In particular, because a lot of the new members wouldn't know this, he decided after his own reflection back when we were the government that he couldn't support the government of the day, the Peterson government, with respect to its policy regarding Meech Lake, nor did he support the policy with respect to free trade.

I say that, not to comment in a substantive way on those issues, but simply to note that the honourable member always brings to a major issue, I think, a great deal of thought and reflection, and doesn't just get up and speak for or against something without really trying to determine what would be in the best interests of his constituents within his riding and of those within the province.

As I listened to his reasoned commentary on the bill, on his criticisms of the bill and on his praise for certain attempts by the government as it seeks to deal with this problem, in my view, his conclusions are all the stronger for it and I would hope that those watching at this hour, as well as those who are in the House, would have listened well and I hope will have learned something from what he said.

**Mr White:** I'd like to congratulate my friend the member for Etobicoke-Humber, not only upon his thoughtful comments but of course, as his colleague mentioned, for his many and lengthy debates and considerations in the past. I believe the member was also responsible for a private member's bill in the past in regard to family mediation, something which I think is an exceptionally good idea, a very creative resolution to some of the very important crises that happen in family life.

It is to members such as himself that we should look in terms of that kind of leadership that he mentioned, and I think we can all look to the leadership our government has introduced in the last number of years in terms of our own pensions, in terms of the Premier's conflict-of-interest guidelines.

For example, we have had a salary freeze for several years. We have taken the lead in that regard. We have said the remuneration here is not the greatest, it's not the highest, but we are not going to increase it, because these are difficult times and we do share those burdens.

To take a look at those kinds of responsibilities, take a look, for example, at the conflict-of-interest guidelines I mentioned that the Premier put out, which clearly prevent members of the government, parliamentary assistants or ministers of the crown from being involved in controversial business arrangements or from what is referred to as "double dipping," taking a salary at the public purse while having a separate income.

The people of Ontario know we have taken responsibility in terms of that reduced income ourselves and that we are not here engaged in many other exceptional circumstances, exceptional incomes. Our dedication is entirely to the public service and to that public leadership.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? If there are none, the honourable member for Etobicoke-Humber has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Henderson:** All these kind things being said leaves one a little speechless, I must say. I want to thank the member for York North for his kind words. It seems to me that in this assembly, in our speaking and voting, we attend to three masters: our parties, our constituents and our consciences. It seems to me that we ought to be attending a little more to our consciences and our constituents and that somehow our accountability to our parties has gotten a little out of whack.

To the member for Durham Centre, yes, thank you also for your kind words. I did put forward a private member's bill to do with family mediation, and I can use that as a bridge into the comments from the member for St Catharines-Brock, who spoke of what she called the very highly innovative measures contained in the



Social Contract Act to lead to a more mediative, more harmonious and more cooperative and less adversarial approach to labour-management matters. I certainly applaud that. I think it's something we need to strive much more towards, both in this Legislative Assembly and in labour-management matters generally.

Two footnotes that I want to add to that: It's not so very innovative; it's something that the Japanese have been doing for a long time and I'm sure many other jurisdictions, but that doesn't mean it isn't a very good idea that we should get on with, and I think we should. Secondly, there is the note I think that, in order for this kind of non-adversarial, cooperative process to work, there needs to be something like a level playing field, and that's why I'm nervous about the sword of Damocles, the August 1 provision, that is built into this piece of legislation, because it makes the playing field a little less than level, in my view.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Murphy:** I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. I do want to pick up on some of the comments made by my colleague the member for Etobicoke-Humber when he talked about the three masters, I guess, that each member has, of party, of constituent and of conscience. I think that's a fine way to start approaching how we deal with things in this assembly, and I think those three masters in this circumstance all speak to one conclusion, and that conclusion is to oppose this bill.

I think we all agree that in the context of a large deficit and an ever-growing debt of a kind that is going to eat up a larger and larger proportion of the public moneys that we prefer to dedicate to valuable public goals, at the rate we're going now the interest alone on the debt could end up being more within the next few years than we spend on educating our children.

Clearly, that's not acceptable.

I and this party and my constituents and in fact my own conscience all speak to the requirement of restraint, the requirement that government get its house in order, that it get its finances in a condition that permits us to provide an opportunity for economic growth, provides us with the opportunity as a government, as a Legislature, to assist where that assistance is needed. But there are principles that should govern that restraint, and one obviously is fairness to the people who are going to be affected. Another is certainty. People have to have the ability to plan their lives, to know what they will be facing. There needs to be a sense of balance between the competing interests.

Finally, I think as part of that process of restraint we have to be attuned to the need to protect those who may not be able to protect themselves, not in a way that creates a dependency but rather that encourages people to get themselves out of situations, encourages them to

participate in some of the wealth that is around us in this society. In that regard, I think the concept of restraint is one that can be applied and needs to be applied.

Unfortunately, this government has come to that conclusion a little bit late in its mandate. It started the train down the track of spending its way out of the recession, of spending more money, of saying, "If we throw money at this problem, it will give us the solution." Too late they came to the realization that that was not the right way to go. Its budget in 1991 was clear.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** We never said that. You said that. We never said that.

**Mr Murphy:** I hear some of the members heckling and I hope they'll participate in the debate to respond, although they haven't in this circle.

If you look at the budget that came out just a few short weeks ago, one of the interesting items, for example, that I haven't heard much comment about is that government expenditure is a percentage of gross domestic product. If you look at the years the Liberal Party was in government, it ranged within the 15% range, never got above 15.7%—I may have my figures a little off, but approximately that—and never went much below 15.2%. It stayed constant. In the first NDP year of governing, it moved up to 17% and then went up to 19% and has stayed at those high levels.

2150

That's the kind of fact that speaks to the notion that they were going to spend their way out of the recession. The interesting thing, if you look at that budget, is that that number does not come down. It's the language of restraint without the substance of restraint.

Part of what needs to be done, obviously, is to do all of this in the context where we encourage the economy to grow, and I think the budget, that this act is part of, does not do that at all.

The \$2 billion imposed in taxes I think will help kill the recovery. It takes money out of the pockets of people who were starting to think about spending it again, who had hunkered down to try and get through the recession, start paying off some credit cards, maybe getting their mortgage payments down. Working families, to use a phrase some of my friends in the NDP like to use, had spent the time trying to get their own house in order. They had done that, and then they were hit with these taxes.

My other concern is that one of the principles has to be certainty so that people can plan. This process has been characterized by chaos, frankly, and that's unfortunate. There are workers, employers, teachers, students in the municipalities, universities, schools, hospitals who don't know what's going on and haven't been able to plan their lives, people who are saying, "I have to

cancel my summer holidays because I don't know what I'm facing in September," teachers who are saying, "What am I facing? Do I have a job?" and students who won't know because of the uncertainty, because of the time line involved in the way this bill and the way this issue has progressed.

I am concerned about the lack of balance, the lack of certainty involved in an August 1 deadline. That is just not sufficient time to negotiate the kind of agreements this government thinks can be negotiated within what is, in essence, five weeks. They're expecting thousands of collective agreements on the sectoral and local level to be negotiated. I think that's an entirely unrealistic expectation.

As to the principle of fairness, this bill does not provide that fairness. Chaos is not fair. Let's look at how some of the provisions in this bill apply; for example, section 24 of the bill as it applies to collective agreements. It's saying that as of June 14, your money is fixed. Therefore, it's related to a fluke, frankly, as to when your collective agreement expired and when it applied, as to what your salary is going to be.

Your neighbour, a member of a different bargaining group, may have been lucky enough to negotiate a collective agreement just a few short months ago whereas you haven't been able to—yours expires in a few months yet it's not negotiated—and therefore you are fixed at the sum of money you were going to be paid on June 14, less than your neighbour.

I got a call just today from some firefighters concerned about the application, firefighters who are still on their 1991 wages, who are going to be frozen at the 1991 level, who've already done their part, yet they will remain frozen at that level while others are being allowed to take the increases. That's not fair to those workers.

There's a similar problem with the arbitration provision in section 40. No arbitration award made after June 14 can apply. So people who were lucky enough to get the arbitration done will get the application of that award to their salaries if it was before June 14, but others won't. Frankly, that is unfair to workers because workers have no control over the arbitration process. Before I was elected on April 1, I was lucky enough, I guess, to participate in some labour arbitrations, and those processes can be very, very slow and time-consuming, over which the workers have no power. Because of the fluke of that time, when the sword of Damocles, as my friend the member for Etobicoke-Humber said, comes down, they can be denied, unlike their neighbour. I think there's not fairness in that.

I think too about the application of pensions. My friend Florence Yaffe from the riding, a wonderful person, came to me and said, "I will be penalized in my pension, because they will take the best five years and I will be fixed for three." She's heading towards retire-

ment, and she's saying, "I will be penalized not just for three years but for the rest of my life, because my pension will be affected by how much is fixed in this wage package," despite what was negotiated, despite what was agreed. That's going to be different for people who are older or younger in the system; that is not fair.

On pensions, on the same issue, there is some concern about this \$500 million which is coming from a reduction in the pension contribution, because it seems to me to be promised in two directions at the same time: at one point to be directed to the cutoff level of \$30,000 and yet it's also promised for the job security fund. The budget has been labelled as "fun with figures," but this is truly exceptional.

I think too about the application of layoffs under the social contract plan versus the expenditure control plan, where there is this job security fund. I'm wondering how the rules are going to be applied to social contract layoffs versus expenditure control plan layoffs. It's not clear in here. It's not fair.

I see the Solicitor General sitting here. I've been approached by administrative service clerks in the probation and parole department of his ministry who received their layoff notices on April 23, or at least an indication that those layoff notices would be provided on July 1. These are primarily women, and they've been provided layoff notices. Will they have access to that job fund? Will the employment equity plan apply to them? They have unanswered questions. They can't find out those answers because this process has been chaotic.

I think too about what this bill has in terms of exemption provisions in section 41. This government has the power to exempt whatever it thinks. They've done that, for example, in the case of Hamilton. The Premier was there some weeks ago and said: "Hamilton's done enough. We will give you an exemption." Who else fits in that same boat? It seems to me that there are a lot of people in municipalities, universities, schools and hospitals who can come and say, "We've done our share; you should give us an exemption." I don't see what the criteria are for providing that exemption.

I think there's an arbitrariness as well in this bill, an extraordinary power allocated to two different groups of people. I'll return to one, but one of them is the minister under the regulation power in this bill. It's an extraordinary allocation of public authority through regulations. That should be an affront to every member in this House. It takes away completely from the power of this institution. Each of the members, regardless of party, should be concerned about that in principle.

The other group I'm concerned about is that the adjudicators under this bill have an extraordinary power. Under subsection 29(3) of this act, an employee or an employer can file an objection that the section 27 criteria haven't been matched; there's a series of those



listed. If you look at the timing of how that process of complaint works, there are 10 days from the deadline of posting to do a complaint, there's an employer response, then there's an objection to the adjudicator.

The adjudicator review under this provision can start, it seems to me, at its earliest at the beginning of September, which creates incredible uncertainty for teachers, who are saying, "What happens to me in the fall?" Yet the adjudicator won't even start considering whether this plan is appropriate to his or her job until the beginning of school. How can they have any certainty? How can they plan?

**2200**

I'm also concerned about the power these adjudicators have. It's an extraordinary power. If you look at what this act says, there's no time limit as to when an adjudicator has to come to a decision. There's no appeal provision, even. To make it an almost draconian, outrageous allocation of power to those individuals, section 46 of this act says the Statutory Powers Procedure Act doesn't apply. There is no natural justice, even, in this process. It's an absence of natural justice in a context where these adjudicators can decide, under the criteria provision, what is fair and equitable. They have wide-open powers to determine what is fair and equitable in each workplace. In the municipal, university, school and hospital sectors, in all of the sectors in the broader public service, these adjudicators have these powers to amend that plan.

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Can you check to see if there's a quorum here in the House?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Mr Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for St George-St David has the floor.

**Mr Murphy:** I'm glad to see that some members are coming in to listen to what I hope is fair comment on the bill. I hope, more importantly, that the people of St George-St David are watching.

I return to my concern about the power of these adjudicators. It's a full and wide-open power to amend that plan. That creates incredible uncertainty, and the interesting thing is that it's in the context where employees are denied even the power to sue, under subsection 33(4). It's an outrageous provision. It's uncertain, it's unfair and it meets none of the principles which even this government says should apply. As I said, it's draconian and it creates incredible confusion.

One of the criteria by which you're going to judge the success of something like this act is whether it

achieves the goals it's supposed to achieve. In this case, that is, are savings achieved? The problem is that the answer is no, it doesn't get that result.

I saw today in the paper, under "Rae may Bend on Deadline to Freeze Pay," that it says he's prepared to hold off on the implementation of some aspects of when this wage freeze kicks in until the end of contracts expiring. I don't see how that is going to be successful in achieving the goal of cutting the \$2 billion this government says it wants to cut by doing this. If they wait, those wage reductions, in whatever form, are not going to be achieved. It's going to be put off again to a future year, so it won't even achieve it in that regard.

I talked earlier about the fact that it's going to relate, in terms of when those savings kick in, to the entire fluke of when your collective agreement expires. You may be lucky enough to have one that expires two years down the road or three years down the road. I realize those are rare collective agreements, but it may very well be that it could wait that long, so you'd be lucky enough to be exempted. I can't see how that is either fair or achieves the saving.

Of particular importance in this regard is the provision related to special leave under section 26, because I think this provision is the real problem with this bill. It's a provision that says, in an undefined way, that where certain people provide special services they are to take unpaid holidays instead of leave when they're to provide services, but they are to be compensated by providing days off in an equivalent amount after March 31, 1996. As a result, employees will have 36 days of paid vacation to take on March 31, 1996.

While the bill says it's not to be taken in pay, it's clear that employers in the broader public sector will have to provide the services, because those are essential services. Someone will have to be hired, likely on overtime, so the cost could be not just 36 days of wages but 50 days of wages or 54. If you take that as a percentage of the salary per year, that could be a cost of \$15,000 to \$20,000 per employee in those essential services. That could be billions of dollars of not restraint but deferred costs, the ticking time bomb that the next government is going to inherit.

That's not restraint. That's not the process of achieving the goal of cutting expenditures. That's hoisting that problem on to someone else, taking credit for it and, frankly, that is a style of governing that the public is fed up with. They're prepared to take restraint, but they want honesty in that restraint and honesty in how that is gone about.

I spoke previously, briefly, about the powers accorded to the government by regulation under section 41. It's extraordinary how much power is accorded. Essentially, by regulation, this government has the power to cut health care amounts, to cut OHIP amounts, to cut drug plan amounts, to set prescribed cuts in certain areas. It's

an incredible array of powers and, as I said, that should be objected to in principle, to provide that much power to the ministry by way of regulation.

That should come to this House and be discussed in a forum where it's appropriate, because it takes away from the power of each member each time that happens. There's some respect that has to be accorded to this institution occasionally, and I think it's important, as a principle, that this be done here and not in the cabinet room or not by bureaucrats.

There are some other specifics in this bill I'd like to speak to, which I think are odd kinds of sections. I think of subsection 35(1), which allows an employer, who is going to be designated again by regulation, to pay a sum of money to the consolidated revenue fund. It doesn't say who, how, why or what for; it just says an employer may be designated by regulation to pay an amount to someone identified in the regulation, "or to credit the prescribed amount to the person or entity, in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time or times." All power allocated by regulation.

I looked at that and I said, "What can that mean?" Can that mean, for example, that this government can pass a regulation and say: "Toronto school board, we don't transfer money to you because of the way the assessment base in this area works. You've got to pay us money." Is that what this is saying? Is this going to allow this government power to pass by regulation the authority that the Toronto school board pay this government money? What other institutions? There's no limit on this.

In theory, this allows the government the right and the authority to designate any employer in the broader public service as someone who should pay into the consolidated revenue fund. It's a nonsensical provision. It makes no sense as written, as I think too the following sections, sections 36 and 37, which deal with provisions related to the health care system.

There's another act in this Parliament which speaks to the issue of the draconian powers allocated to the minister to provide health by bureaucracy, and these reinforce that position. This is an outrage, to provide this much power to the Minister of Health to do things without the proper forum for the debate of these issues. You can reduce OHIP fees, reduce the amounts paid to independent health fees, to dispensing fees, reduce income limits under OHIP and the drug benefit plan. It's an incredible power allocated under this bill.

2210

The third provision I'd like to talk about is section 25, related to unpaid leave provided in an existing collective agreement. This provision says, "If a collective agreement provides for unpaid leaves of absence or other temporary layoffs, the employer must utilize those provisions before requiring unpaid leaves under subsection (1)."

The question I have is, to what does that apply? That's a fairly broad section. Does that mean every single collective agreement temporary leave program must be taken advantage of regardless of its impact on the employee? It can't mean that, but that's what it says. This is a bill drafted in haste, drafted without thought, drafted without consideration for its impact. It's clear on its face.

There's another one, and I think the one provision which speaks most to that drafted without consideration for what it means is subsection 33(2) which to me, having practised for a time as a lawyer, says nothing. It's the strangest section, subsection 33(2). "Nothing in this part interferes with any right to carry on collective bargaining so long as any collective agreement reached is not inconsistent with this act." It's saying this act doesn't contravene collective bargaining rights as long as those collective bargaining rights don't contravene this act. Well, that is a useless provision.

The question is whether there is an alternative. I think my leader, Lyn McLeod, has spoken to a sensible plan. She has been saying from the beginning, and it's a program I agree with, that we should do the Ontario public service first to set a context, to create certainty and to create an area within which we can set the ground rules and then apply those once we've learned those lessons. I spoke earlier of those principles of balance, of certainty, of fairness. We can apply those in an area where we have that concern.

In fact, I was speaking a few days ago with the president of the hospital in my riding, the Wellesley Hospital. He's an extraordinarily talented gentleman who has, over the course of the last number of years, made that hospital a fine example of a quality institution that has moved to provide a service to the community that the community wants. A tremendous outreach.

He said: "I want to be able to do this ourselves. We are best able to figure out how to do this. Don't force this on us, just let me deal with it." I hear that from all the other institutions in my riding, schools at the elementary and secondary level, the school board and the universities that touch on my riding—Ryerson, a new university, and to a certain degree the University of Toronto. They are saying, "We want our chance to do this."

It seems to me that when you think about it, governments really only have a few things on the agenda that they can do well. One or two or three maybe, and you've got to try and do those well and let the rest take care of itself. This government has tried to head out in too many directions, figured out that it shouldn't have headed out in that direction and tries to draw back in.

This is an example. They headed off in that direction in the 1991 budget of an expenditure growth pattern, as I said earlier, that moved from 15% of gross domestic product up to 19% of gross domestic product and



realized the problem. They are now trying to draw back in. They could have taken the time to consider this and to move forward in a more systematic, careful, balanced way at an earlier stage; they could have achieved these savings in a way that doesn't create the chaos and uncertainty, because there are other things that management by chaos has created.

I think, for example, of the expenditure control plan cuts in Community and Social Services which affect a great part of my riding. There are people who live in Regent Park, St Jamestown, Cabbagetown and other areas who are recipients of the services provided by Community and Social Services. They spoke to me during the campaign and afterwards and said: "We don't want to be dependants of the government. We want an opportunity to use our skills to move off social assistance."

Yet, for example, the expenditure control plan, because of the bad planning, is taking away some of the very programs that provide for that opportunity. I think of STEP, which was a program started by the Liberal government and maintained in part for a period of time by this government, yet is now being cut. It provided people with an opportunity to keep some of the income they earned, if they were employed, on social assistance. What they're proposing to do is reduce the amount that they can keep, including, for example, disabled people—to reduce that amount. That strikes me as unfair, completely contrary to the ideals that I certainly espouse and I thought at one point the NDP espoused as well.

There are kind of silly things in that as well, for example, the minimum cheque amount in Community and Social Services for sending out drug and dental benefits to individuals who don't have quite a low enough income to get social assistance. That minimum cheque is now going to be one cent. It probably costs about \$35 in administration to issue a one-cent cheque. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me. There are probably smarter ways of doing that.

Now, I know that there is another party in this House, the Conservatives, who have said, "We have some amendments to this bill and we'll support it." I don't think those amendments are going to make that work. They have moved back and forth in terms of whether they're going to support the bill or not. I think that really, at its core, reflects their concern with the bill combined with their support of restraint. I think that if you look at this bill, you'll see that supporting this bill won't achieve those goals.

A notion that somehow wage attrition, for example, which has been proposed by the leader of the third party, can affect that result, that doesn't work in achieving those goals either. I mean, for example, it assumes that there will be a 3% increase every year from now in the amount of wages paid to the public

service. Well, that's clearly a false assumption but it's built into that option.

I think, finally, of some of the agencies and services in the Solicitor General area, for example, police. I was talking to police in the great northwest over the past few days. They're fed up. They say: "We've paid our share. We're out on the front lines trying to serve the broader public and we're being attacked. We're being cut. We've attempted, through the municipalities, to negotiate fair return. For example, Thunder Bay has dropped considerably in terms of its comparative pay. Yet it's being asked to take more."

There's an unfairness built into this which I think is unacceptable. We go back to the principles that I articulated at the beginning: fairness, balance, certainty and an effort to protect others who can't protect themselves. This bill does not live up to those principles.

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I appreciated the information submitted to us by the member for St George-St David. I appreciate him pointing out how complicated this legislation really is in all aspects of it. I must say I find it very difficult to understand. That may not amaze many people here of course.

I have learned over the years to decipher most of the statutes no matter how complicated they are and their regulations thereto. In searching through the statutes, of course, you get the statutes out and the revised statutes and the updated statutes and the annotated statutes and trace it through.

I must say many things are much too complicated and much too restrictive. I think those words apply to this bill indeed. Surely there are much simpler ways. We know there are simpler ways to accomplish what the government intended by this bill, because the member for St George-St David has pointed out some of those. I appreciate his efforts in that regard.

Surely there is time to make many changes to this bill yet that would benefit the people who are affected by the proposed bill, the government that has prepared the bill and is going to see it through, so to speak, and indeed all of us who have to work with it and are affected by it.

2220

**Mr Beer:** I want to commend the member for St George-St David for his speech. I think it's appropriate to note that, as a new member from April 1, he has now spoken on a number of occasions, both in question period, statements and debates on bills. I think he has shown, for any member but particularly a new member, a very quick grasp of some of the complex issues that we deal with. I think as one followed him through his analysis of the social contract, he was very much on track.

The member made reference to being up in the northwest last week. A number of us were up in a

variety of places: Atikokan, Fort Frances—I note the presence of the Minister of Natural Resources; it was good for us to have that opportunity to visit areas in his riding—Thunder Bay, of course, where our leader is from, Dryden, Red Rock and Nipigon. We were talking to representatives of police forces, school boards, municipalities, conservation authorities and just people in those communities.

I think one of the points that was made and came out in my colleague's comments was the tremendous amount of confusion out there as to just what is the social contract. What is it going to mean? How does it impact in our communities? People were telling us, in the different areas, of things that had been going on over the last couple of years as they've tried to wrestle with problems around a lack of funds and cutbacks.

Here we have something that is now being brought forward where there is no clear plan, no real sense of direction. Indeed, the ends which the government says it's seeking are simply not going to be met by a bill which, as my colleague has said, is seriously flawed and unworkable.

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** It's a pleasure to rise and, first of all, begin by congratulating my colleague the member for St George-St David for his thorough analysis of the legislation about which we speak this evening. It's always good to get an analysis from a lawyer—at a good rate, I might add—in order to outline some of the difficulties which are not readily apparent to the rest of us, let me put it that way.

I think it's important to recognize, as the member outlined, that the seeds for this harvest, the seeds for this economic state of affairs, were sown when the NDP brought in its very first budget. The government decided, very deliberately at that point in time, that it was going to fight the recession and not the deficit.

Lo and behold, I think it was on March 30 that the Premier on his road to Damascus decided that he was heading in the wrong direction, experienced a conversion and now he's responding in what at best could be characterized as a chaotic manner; perhaps better described as jumping from ice floe to ice floe. That's created, unfortunately, a great deal of apprehension in the broader community.

Just to speak briefly on behalf of the sector that I bring special representation to, colleges and universities: Colleges, for the first time this year, have sent out notices of acceptance which are conditional upon results of these negotiations which are under way. Furthermore, 91,000 students will not be gaining access, will not be permitted entry into our colleges and universities this year, largely as a result of these negotiations and their ultimate outcome which would undoubtedly not be good.

**Mr Ramsay:** I'd like to commend my colleague

from St George-St David who, as my other colleague had mentioned, has only been in this House really a relatively few months and yet has really gotten into all of the debates and responded well and brought forward issues like we will see tomorrow morning, issues on his own initiative and responded well to speaking on behalf of his riding and his particular causes and speaking on behalf of our party, which I think is really excellent.

We are here tonight to really finish up a debate on the so-called social contract. In a few more minutes I will certainly be speaking on that and trying to relate to people how we feel about this issue and why we won't be supporting this legislation. I think it's important for the people to realize that this sort of slash-and-burn approach to managing government is not the way to proceed, that there are other ways to do that, and I will be putting forward some very positive suggestions as to how we should be proceeding. In fact, how we should be proceeding is reorganizing government and not just somehow downsizing the type of government we have today but remanaging, reorganizing what we do and how we do it.

I think that's the way to proceed, and I am certainly glad to have the opportunity, later on, to speak to that because I think we have different demands today in 1993. Basically we have, I guess, a government structure that was established probably in 1893 and not for 1993. I think it's important that we talk about that, put forward some ideas rather than totally downsizing and taking away benefits that people have worked long and hard, over the years, to accrue for them and the people in their union. So I look forward to that opportunity in a little while. Thank you for this opportunity to bring my remarks forward now.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for St George-St David has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Murphy:** I'm very pleased that it was four colleagues from the Liberal Party who stood and made comments in the House. It's unfortunate that the government members aren't prepared to listen to suggestions to change their legislation to even participate in the debate. I do want to say to the member for Brant-Haldimand that, although he's shy enough to say that it was too difficult to understand, not for a moment do I believe it. I know he has an almost lawyer-like mind and I've seen it in practice.

To the member for York North, I very much appreciate the compliment and thank you very much. To the member for Ottawa South, I thought the suggestion that it's always helpful to have an analysis from a lawyer is an interesting one, coming as it was from another lawyer.

To the member for Timiskaming, I appreciate his comments as well and I know he will speak quite eloquently about the issue of alternatives and about the issue of an institution, frankly, designed in the 19th



century that we're trying to accommodate to this modern reality. I know there is an interesting book called *Reinventing Government* which has some fascinating suggestions in it in that regard about the alternatives that can be available for providing the services we want to provide in a way that's effective and efficient. I know he'll speak eloquently about that.

I finally just want to say it's an unfortunate thing that we are speaking at this late hour in an assembly that may not be paying quite as much attention to the content of the debate as would otherwise be the case, I hope, and I hope they will listen to what the people are saying and change this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate. The honourable member for Brant-Haldimand.

**Mr Eddy:** I welcome the opportunity to speak to the bill which has caused so much consternation among the many members of this House and indeed citizens throughout the province of Ontario.

As you know, I arrived in April 1992 in a by-election, one and one half years after the general election held in September 1990, wherein for the first time in this province the NDP government, a large majority government, was elected.

It was not the first time in the history of the province that the voters of Ontario rejected the old-line parties and elected a brand-new party that had never served before, because that happened once before, in 1919, when the United Farmers of Ontario were elected and swept the province and lasted, I believe, an entire term, as I recall. With them came, of course, the late honourable Harry Nixon, who started his career at that particular time.

As you know, I arrived as a fresh new face to the Legislature, thinking that because there was a majority government, it would do everything possible to correct the many problems this province was facing in very adverse economic conditions—a very serious recession, as it turns out.

2230

I would rather say that I felt somewhat like a duck out of water, because I'd been used to participating in a system of government where good ideas submitted by any member or any presenter were taken into consideration and, if not the entire idea, at least the best parts of ideas were taken and incorporated into reports and became the subject then of bylaws or rules and regulations. I think more of that should happen here. I would hope that we could start a trend that way, and indeed as soon as possible.

I rise to speak in opposition to the NDP government's social contract legislation because I feel it is unworkable and will not achieve the targeted \$2 billion in savings. I am prepared to support a bill that is workable, makes sense and achieves real restraint but cannot support the

muddled plan of a government that is desperate for anything that looks like a solution.

This bill will only create more turmoil and confusion. It is an incompetent piece of legislation produced by a government that has completely mismanaged the province's finances, and I say that simply because the government came in and experienced a large deficit the first year and of course proceeded with ever-increasing deficits and a larger and larger accumulated debt, and we know what that does to any business, any industry, any individual or any government. It catches up with you.

My leader has called the legislation a bureaucratic nightmare that renders locally negotiated agreements between management and employees virtually impossible to achieve. We support restraint, but the Premier's cure is worse than the disease.

A number of flaws in the legislation include the following:

(1) The deferred-leave provision means up to 36 days in paid vacation will be owed to an undetermined number of workers in essential services. In effect there will be no savings but a deferral of costs until 1996. I think that's very, very serious, and that's one of the things that must be changed about this bill.

(2) There is no true local bargaining, only cumbersome and unworkable layers of negotiation.

(3) The time lines for reaching agreements are unrealistic.

(4) The worker redeployment scheme in the government's final contract offer is impossible to implement and there is no alternative spelled out in the legislation.

So in opposition I will be voting against the legislation on second reading. Should it pass that stage, I'm sure that this caucus will try to force the government to hold public hearings on this dangerously flawed bill.

The need for a social contract could have been avoided had the Premier and his government properly managed Ontario's finances from the time it came to office two and a half years ago. Had the government recognized and dealt with Ontario's economic difficulties a lot earlier, the government would not find itself in the mess it is today, and that's because of the increasing deficits. That's what I'm talking about, and I think really the provincial expenditures, if they'd been controlled or constrained in many ways earlier, and I think we've—

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** Who governed Ontario in the rich days and left it with a deficit?

**Mr Eddy:** Well, we have given many examples. There have been many examples given in the House.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Who called an election quick in order to duck the difficulty?

**Mr Eddy:** Well, elections are called at a time when the government in power decides it is the most opportune time, I suppose, and perhaps your government will be calling an election at what you would consider the most opportune time.

**Mr White:** Are you saying that Liberals are opportunists?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Eddy:** Well, yes, of course, we're certainly optimistic. Optimism is eternal in the human. Optimists—

**Mr White:** No, no, not optimists; opportunists.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Robert Nixon was an optimist.

**Mr Eddy:** Thank you.

We support restraint and believe the government should set clear financial targets, negotiate with its own employees and give the public sector the tools to negotiate at the local level. I think it would pay off. It's good advice; it's sound advice. It's not just my advice; it comes from our entire caucus, but I certainly support it and think that it should be followed.

**Mr White:** I always respect your advice.

**Mr Eddy:** Yes, I agree with it completely.

As I say, I arrived, and I made the decision consciously, knowing that there was a recession, that things were very tough in the province at the time, but decided to come down, in a view of hoping that I could help my constituents.

Certainly, parts of my constituency have been hurt very seriously by the recession, and some parts long before this recession arrived. I'm thinking primarily of the Dunnville area that has lost industry over a period of, say, 15 years. It's very serious and it grieves me deeply to think of the unemployed in that area, although the people are doing the best they can in many ways, trying to develop the tourism industry that is there and has been there for many years, trying to further that and develop it as time goes by. But it is very difficult.

I had hoped to help solve the many problems of the province, endured by the citizens of Ontario, Canada's industrial, commercial and agricultural heartland. I knew that any government elected by such a large majority would be striving tirelessly to clean up the economic mess that was choking Ontario to a standstill and to restore Ontario to its primary position as the heartland in this fair country we call Canada. But what did I find? More and more industries downsizing, going out of business and moving south of the border.

Why are so many industries leaving Ontario? We hear many reasons given over time for what has happened. I guess one of the most important things is the inordinately high level of taxation at all levels: federal, provincial and municipal. We've just seen a very large increase of several taxes at the provincial level. I don't

know what's going to happen at the federal level, but we certainly may be faced with that as well.

There are many other costs that are very high in Ontario, unfortunately, that are causing industry a great deal of problems. Of course, the cost of hydro-electric energy has been increasing, and it's very serious. Workers' compensation premiums have been cited by many industries as a real burden. More recently, some industries cite restrictive amendments to the Labour Relations Act and overzealous health and safety training programs, including clerical staff, and the list goes on.

Unfortunately, big governments don't react, it seems, quickly enough to control downturns in the economy, or not as quickly as they should. I guess it varies with the government, but they have to act more quickly to stop the haemorrhaging or it's going to be even more serious. I'm sure we all agree that Ontario has lost too many industries and jobs, too many businesses and jobs and too many farming operations and jobs. Equally unfortunate is the loss of all those growth industries and businesses that would have been started, that would have expanded and that would have hired our youth, our students and our unemployed.

In my area, with an unemployment rate of almost 15%, and I know in the southern part of the riding with an even higher rate, it's a great concern. Not only is the present rate of unemployment a tremendous concern to people, but of course it's the unknown of those who are presently employed, what they face. How long will they have jobs? We have many instances of one person in a family carrying family members at the present time who are unemployed.

2240

I realize that municipal governments react ever so much quicker to adverse economic conditions, even when confronted with mounting unpaid taxes and increasing requisitions from the many special purpose bodies, such as police services boards and school boards etc. We have to give them credit, though, because municipalities for a number of years, in order to bring in zero increases in their budgets and zero mill rate increases, have worked very hard at balancing their annual budgets. They've reduced services and made them much more efficient, in the face of mounting unpaid taxes, which is a very serious thing at present.

There's been considerable downloading over the years, and even recently, by the provincial government to the municipalities. That's a very serious thing, because it's costly. We must recall that the property tax rate produces a great deal of the money that the municipalities and school boards operate on, and that those taxes are paid by individual home owners, many of whom are out of work, and businesses, many of which are in considerable difficulty in the world today, trying to compete, although I must say there are some very bright stories.



I had the opportunity a week ago to tour the Westinghouse plant in Hamilton and see that it's producing gas turbines there that are being shipped all over the world. We learned how they had come to grips with their particular high costs and the phasing out of transformers and other things they had made there that there weren't any orders for any more, and how they have cleaned up and turned around a factory that was first opened, I believe, in 1903, producing turbines that are shipped all over the world and sold on any basis that the customer wishes to buy them on.

In other words, they'll sell the turbines at the gate, they'll deliver them, set them up, start them running and sell them. They will continue to operate them for the customers. It was a very enlightening experience. I think anyone who has the opportunity should visit that plant, because I was thrilled there. It's a complete success story except that you find that the staff complement is much less. It's an automated plant. Many things are done by automation that were done by people previously. This presents another problem.

I also had the opportunity, just a few days ago, of touring the Boise Cascade plant at Fort Frances, which makes some of the finest quality paper on the continent. There, again, you find an automatic packaging area that used to employ 27 people. I think there are two people there running the computer controls that do the work.

Coming back to municipal government, I will take this opportunity to congratulate what our municipal governments, the elected people of the province at the local level, are doing and have done. I think it's most unfortunate that after going through the agony and the throes of coming in with balanced budgets for this calendar year, with no increase in tax rate in many cases and giving the local taxpayers a break, and indeed using up reserves that were built up for specific purposes over the years, they now find themselves facing a whole new round of reductions and paring of services. It's very serious and I wish we could do something about it.

The Municipal Act of course requires that municipalities have balanced budgets. If they have a surplus or a deficit for any given year, that becomes the first item of revenue or, conversely, of expenditure in the next year's budget.

Unfortunately, the province of Ontario, the provincial government, indeed the federal government, are not so regulated. There are no limits on annual deficits nor accumulated debt. That's unfortunate. Some, of course, would advocate that there should be laws. Of course, if you have laws of governmental body they can be amended and changed. But it is awfully important because we realize that as the accumulated debt gets larger and larger and larger, it uses up more of the revenue that's collected through the many types of taxes the province has.

It ends up that the cost of credit becomes higher and

higher and higher, and one day, as we know, the credit door can be slammed in your face: slammed, and there is no credit, and that happened in New Zealand. I'm sure it will not happen here with the determination of the opposition to see that does not happen in Ontario.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the municipal governments in this province, and I must say I did realize that the government has said that the amount it wanted to reduce in this fiscal year—

**Mr McGuinty:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I do not believe that the government is fulfilling its responsibility to maintain a quorum.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the table determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Brant-Haldimand may resume his remarks.

**Mr Eddy:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. That certainly revived me. I do appreciate at this hour—as you know, it gets on and I was here and sat through till midnight last night. I enjoyed it very much because it is an educational experience. I'm utterly amazed at the ability of some of my colleagues in explaining the act and going into the details of it, and it certainly has helped me considerably.

I was saying about the municipalities doing a good job, and I know they're certainly going through the agony of looking at budgets all over again, and here we are at June 22, which, of course, is half the year.

I believe, as I was speaking before, I was saying that I noted that the government has announced that the amount that was to be saved by the social contract in the province's fiscal year—that is, April 1, 1993 to March 31, 1994—will be spread over, I believe, the same period for the municipalities, which is a little help, but I don't know that it's really going to help very much.

Leaving municipal government, I won't speak about my favourite subject this evening, the London-Middlesex situation. Although some of my colleagues have asked me to include that particular subject in my speech, I think I will leave that for another time. I want to turn just briefly and talk about the agricultural industry too, and speak about the many things that are so adversely affected by the present economy.

It grieves me that the budgets of OMAF regarding agriculture programs have been cut so drastically at least two years in a row since the government has been in. It's a very serious situation. Agriculture is very seriously affected.

## 2250

The farm tax rebate, of course, has been frozen, and that's going to be very serious, especially where municipalities are going on market value assessment and where there are increases in the mill rate. It means that everybody, all farmers, will share in that reduction, and I assure you most farms can't bear any increases. They're seriously affected now. It grieves me that so many family farms are going out of business. They're finding it very, very tough.

The great labour saver of this province, of course, was the introduction of hydro-electric power. I didn't share in that as early as some of the farmers in the province of Ontario. We got it as soon after the war as it was possible, but of course supplies were rationed. As I recall, the barns and the home were wired, and we waited for some two years till we finally got hydro. So you might say I was raised in the dark to a certain extent, but I've tried to overcome that.

It seems to me in talking about agriculture that no matter how hard farmers work, they're facing a losing proposition. I'm thinking of adverse economic conditions, adverse weather. We experience this.

Coming back to Bill 48, which is the subject of the evening's discussions, I've stated why we oppose it in its present form, why we have hopes and indeed pray there will be changes that will be made to make it more acceptable to all the people whom it affects.

There have been many things left out of the bill that we feel were important elements of the social contract proposal. How they will be dealt with, I don't know, but there are such things as openness and accountability.

The one thing we note is that the government proposed to update the major stakeholders in each sector on a quarterly basis and to provide them with access to ministry-level financial information, and there's no provision for that in the bill.

The bill does not establish sector task forces to review procurement, contracting and organizational structures.

The bill does not provide whistle-blowing protection to the Ontario public service or the broader public sector. I think that's a very important thing. That's been discussed many times. I won't go into it in detail, but it is a serious matter.

There's the restructuring, reskilling and redeployment provisions which are very serious and causing great concern.

Capital infrastructure investment.

Reforming collective bargaining: The bill does not provide that public sector labour relations legislation will be harmonized with the Ontario Labour Relations Act, but an act to amend the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act has been introduced at the same time as this bill, and that of course is largely imple-

menting that proposal.

The financial adjustments are very serious, the pension payment savings. The \$400 million or \$500 million per year in pension payment savings to the government will not be allocated to the reduction of the overall \$2-billion social contract target as originally proposed. Indeed, instead, this money will be used to make up any shortfall resulting from the reduction of an employer's target under the incentive provisions described above.

Joint trusteeship of public sector pension plans is not mandated by this legislation, but it is suggested as a possible provision of the sectoral framework.

This bill does not freeze progress through the ranks as the proposals did. Benefit improvements are not mentioned and were to be postponed under the proposals.

Implementation: The bill does not establish sector task forces to discuss issues such as labour adjustment and training, procurement and contracting systems, organizational structures and procedures, portability of benefits and efficiency and productivity initiatives, but they are suggested terms of a sectoral agreement.

Joint workplace committees have not been established to address workplace training, efficiency and cost-savings measures and the organization of work, but there are also suggested terms.

A dispute resolution procedure—mediation and arbitration—was not established.

There are many things that we find are a problem with the bill. As I say, we'll be looking forward to the many amendments that should be made to this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Brant-Haldimand for his contribution to this debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr McLean:** I wanted to take a couple of minutes to comment briefly on the member for Brant-Haldimand. I left the member for St George-St David and I see he has left the House. I thought I could do the two of them at once, but I know that's not allowed.

I wanted to comment briefly on the aspects that he brought into the debate with regard to some of the legal entanglements that he anticipated may be taking place within this legislation. I listened to him intently. I wasn't in the House for all of it, but I listened to it and I know that the member for St George-St David added a little different aspect to the debate totally.

I want to say to the member for Brant-Haldimand that he mentioned in his remarks some 15 years over which neglect has taken place with regard to the riding he's from. He mentioned something about Dunnville, the problems it's having. Well, I find it hard to read him when it was the Treasurer of this province who represented that riding and I find it hard to understand how



that riding could be so hard done by being represented by the Treasurer.

I haven't heard much from the member for Brant-Haldimand as to whether Earl's Shell is still in business or not. I do know, though, that when I float through Gingersnap Junction and get to Orillia and see Connor Tire, on Friday mornings mostly, that's where I meet the boys and we discuss what's taking place within the province of Ontario. They bring me up to date pretty well with what's going on in small-town Ontario.

I was intrigued by the member for Brant-Haldimand with regard to his comments and I appreciate the different aspect that he brought to the debate.

**Mr Murphy:** I appreciate the opportunity to say thank you to the member for Simcoe East. I must say that every time I go and visit my parents, who live in Horseshoe Valley, I pass by his fine farmhouse and see his name up on the side of the barn, which I always am quite jealous of because it's the largest sign location in the area, and one of the better ones, I must say.

Having grown up in Barrie, not far away, just in the next riding, and having spent the first 18 years of my life—I know the member for Simcoe East is a fixture in that community, almost not as someone who's thought of in any party way but as just the MPP. They're not separable concepts, almost.

Let me say that I think the member for Brant-Haldimand will attain that same lofty status on the basis of the kind of quality contribution he's made to the debate on this Social Contract Act. It was cogent, intelligent, insightful, as in fact I think his contributions always are. I appreciate the opportunity.

I thank the member for Timiskaming for his intervention on my behalf. I just hope that we'll be able to continue to hear that kind of contribution in the course of this debate and I hope the government is listening to the representatives of the community at large. They're out there watching television, I hope, just in the few minutes before prime time comes on. I know that they're listening, they're concerned, they're watching, and they're judging the actions of this government and I think, frankly, they're judging those actions quite harshly.

2300

**Mr Cleary:** I would like to compliment the member on his statements and I'd like to just briefly talk about the agricultural part of it where he commented about the farm tax rebate and how provincial funding had diminished to the agricultural community over the past few years in land stewardship and farm-start programs.

The other thing I'd like to mention too is the closing down of the government's foreign trade offices. We don't know how that's going to affect agriculture also. The other thing that I would like to mention there was something that's on everyone's mind, the cutting back

of dairy inspectors all over Ontario. I think food safety is a big factor in everyone's mind and I know that the only people who can do the proper job on that is the dairy inspection branch.

I'm a little bit leery of what may eventually come out of this if these inspectors are cut back. I'm just a little bit leery that maybe the cost and extra burden will be placed on farmers themselves. If they have to pay for this inspection, it'll be just as bad or worse than the government cutting back on their programs.

I know the member mentioned about rural Ontario, Ontario Hydro, being in the dark about 1946. I guess he wasn't alone on that, because many of us in other parts of Ontario were the same. Anyway, we have Ontario Hydro now and I hope we can afford to keep it.

**Mr Hope:** I noticed that very interestingly the member said, "the past two years," and I guess if he comes from a rural community he'll know that the agricultural community's been suffering for about 10 years, if not more. If you took that proposed package that is before you today, that the government is presenting under the legislation, and talked to your farmers about that proposed package, they'd probably tell you it's too rich a program for the public sector unions. They'll say, "What do you mean, subsidizing their wages for 95%?" because I've heard that from the farmers. "What are you talking about, putting \$300 million before that package?"

If you're talking to the farmers, they'll tell you that they've been feeling the effects since the early 1980s under a different government. They're feeling the effects of the free trade agreement. They're feeling the effects of the subsidizing of the products they manufacture, that not even half of the product they produce is for human consumption. That's a cheap food policy. If you're listening to the farmers most appropriate, the farmers are talking about farm-gate pricing, and that's where they're indicating your aspects of it.

I find it interesting that you talk about the farm tax rebate. I question the previous government, why you even tapped into it to begin with. You brought it forward. You're the one who tapped into this process. You were a part of the process that brought it forward. Why did you even tap into that farm tax issue, taxing agricultural fuel for education?

Then I pose some other questions which I think are very important. I'm just curious about the opinion of where you stand, if you're talking about rural communities, on the issue about unionization of farmers, because that's a bill that's going to be coming forward very shortly.

I just wondered, because you talk about the rural communities and I think it's appropriate that you currently reflect those communities, because I represent a large—I guess you'd call it God's country in south-

western Ontario, where Chatham is located, around those communities, at Dover and Chatham township, because I hear my farmers very clearly and they aren't saying what I just heard.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Brant-Haldimand has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Eddy:** I want to thank the member for Simcoe East in drawing to our attention that the riding was represented by the former Treasurer of Ontario, the Honourable Robert Nixon. Indeed, the Dunnville area was represented prior to that by another Treasurer, the Honourable James Allan, of course, who was a member of his party, as I understand. I didn't know him quite as well, of course. So thank you. The member for St George-St David has overwhelmed me, and I'm sure that my relatives who are watching tonight, who stayed up to watch, will have as difficult time identifying me through his description as I do, but thank you.

I want to thank the member for Cornwall for his comment about the agricultural industry, because I know how heartfelt his thoughts are about the agriculture industry and what it's been going through. For many years I acknowledged that, and I know you feel that very deeply.

The member for Chatham-Kent, thank you for mentioning your farmers and what they feel, and indeed it is a cheap food policy that's the problem. But it's not just a cheap food policy; it's a too-cheap food policy, perhaps. The farm tax rebate program was brought in as a matter of survival. Farms would not have survived without the farm tax rebate. There is perhaps a better answer to that, and I'll be pleased to present something along those lines and discuss it with him prior to bringing it in if he has some thoughts on that matter.

So back to Bill 48, and that's why we're here, I would hope we can bring some very important, serious amendments to this bill to make it workable.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr Ramsay:** I'm very pleased at this late hour to have so many of my colleagues behind me. I'm not sure; yes, they're behind me. They're doing very well and very are wide awake, by the sound of them. I'm very pleased to follow my colleague the member for Brant-Haldimand. In fact, he mentioned that some of his relatives are watching. I know my mother is watching, because I called her about three minutes ago to tell her I'd be on. I'm concerned that we spend a lot of money here with the legislative service, the electronic Hansard, and I am not sure how many people watch at this late hour, but I know my mother is a dedicated watcher and she is watching, so be assured that somebody is at least watching and this is for some good.

Just to remind the folks here, especially those watching at home, what we're here about tonight is to conclude our speeches on the social contract legislation,

Bill 48. There has been lots in the news about that. It is the government's expenditure control legislation to grab back \$2 billion from the budget, and in this piece of legislation they are attempting to do that from the public service. As we know, there's been lots of controversy about this. The unions are unsettled and somewhat troubled, if I may use slightly mild language, about this because these wages and benefits have been hard-fought-for over the years; they have bargained through the collective bargaining process, a process that I think all of us in this House respect and support and of course are loath to let these go because they have been hard-fought-for over the years.

But we also are concerned, as most of the general public is concerned, about the deficit. I think I'd like to start there and talk about why we have this problem. I'd like to talk to the government members and say that this isn't all their fault. What concerns me about the process they are embarked upon now is that with this sudden zeal they have taken upon themselves, to me it seems they somehow feel that this is all their fault, and of course it's not all their fault. I think they certainly added to the problem in the last two and a half years for which they have been responsible, but our government was a good-spending government, very healthy expenditures in our budgets—we were able to do that, though, because we had some very healthy times to do that—and the government before us, when the Tories were in government for 42 years, had many deficits, so they've contributed to this too. We have had the last 100 years really to come up to this particular level of expenditure and this accumulated debt that we find we've inherited.

I say this because I've been very concerned about some of the methods employed by this government in how they want to grab back this money. It has done some terrible damage across this province. My particular riding has been particularly hard hit, and I'm going to talk about that a little more.

2310

It's not any one particular party's fault, though I think we have been critical in the last two years, consistently so, about the budgets of this particular government. We have seen a record number of deficits from this government exceeding the \$10-billion mark, so that this government, being in office only two and a half years, has now doubled the accumulated debt of this province. That's what the problem is, and this government now has finally realized, like the rest of us have and the people of Ontario, that we cannot continue in this way.

**Mr Murphy:** It's entirely true. Argentinian in proportion.

**Mr Ramsay:** Well, that is the case. We're at that point, and we know we can no longer have an increasing percentage of our revenues being paid towards



servicing the debt. That's where we're going. The government has finally seen this.

I suppose there's a lot of anecdotal talk around Queen's Park about what caused this conversion of Robert Rae, the Premier of Ontario, and the government party, as this certainly wasn't the pattern of the first two budgets. Some will say that somewhere during the winter, Mr Rae maybe had a conversation with New York bankers or the bond rating companies in New York that actually rate Ontario on its fiscal health and decide how much money we have to pay on our interest and what interest rate Ontario has to pay in order to service its debt. We think it could be that: It looked as if the situation was that if we continued in Ontario to have increasingly large budget deficits and accumulated total debt, finally the world would stop lending to Ontario.

That's certainly one scenario, and that maybe comes together, coincidentally, with the show W5 on CTV, which showed back in February of this year a documentary on the so-called bankruptcy of New Zealand that happened about eight years ago. I think that really shook up a lot of people too. As I said, anecdotally around here, people feel that certain cabinet ministers and the Premier himself watched this show over and over and were really taken aback by this and certainly didn't want this to be happening in Ontario.

Well, nobody wants this to be happening in Ontario, so we agree with the government that the deficit is a problem and that we've got to be concerned about it. I guess the reason we've got to this point is the really high expectations of the people of this country and the reluctance of politicians in this country over the last 20, 30 or 40 years to say no to people when they have asked for more and more goods and services from government. I'm going to suggest later on some positive examples, I think, of what we should be doing in government, but part of this exercise has got to be that politicians are going to have to start to say no to people. When people, my constituents, people who vote for me and vote for the rest of us, keep coming to us and asking for more and more services, we're going to have to start to say no and we're going to have to start to lower people's expectations.

I think we're going to have to start to make a whole cultural change in our society, because I think what we've done in the last 50 or 60 years is move away from individual initiative and self-reliance and self-sufficiency to a dependency upon government. We haven't, when a neighbour has lost his barn or her house, come together as neighbours and rebuilt those facilities for our neighbours, helped that family in a community that's found itself in tough times. The community in the old days gathered together, rounded up resources and food and clothing and built them new shelter and got that family back on its feet.

For the last 50 or 60 years, basically, we've relied upon government to do that. We've lost that sense of not only individual enterprise but community enterprise, and I think we have to go back to that. We have to somehow return to those days of understanding that it's not, "What can the government do for me? What are my entitlements from government? What can I expect from government?" but, "What can I do for myself, for my family, to keep ourselves above water and supporting ourselves?" and also the next step of, "What can we do for each other and for our community?" If that's maybe brought more to an individual level and a community level, I think we'd be far better off. I think that's what we have to change, too: We have to be looking at how we govern and what's happened. I'm going to talk about that a little later, about how I think we can move that way and what we need to do.

But what I've been very concerned about is this piece of legislation and what preceded that: the other \$2 billion that the government took from the people of Ontario in this slash-and-burn process of closing institutions, changing the relocation jobs where we were sharing some of the wealth of the government to people right across Ontario.

One of the things I'm very concerned about and that I know my colleague from Northumberland, Joan Fawcett, who's also here this evening, is very concerned about as one of our co-Agriculture critics—John Cleary from Cornwall is the other ag critic and is also here this evening—is the two agricultural colleges that were closed by this government in the process that just preceded this \$2-billion clawback.

One of those was in my riding, and I certainly want to talk about it because it's had a devastating effect on the people of my riding and I feel very concerned about that. But it also has had a devastating effect on the agricultural community not only across the province, because in New Liskeard we did agricultural research for some sectors of the agricultural industry, right in New Liskeard for the whole province, but especially because New Liskeard is really the only northern outpost the government of Ontario has had for 75 years for agriculture in this province.

With just a swipe of the pen, this government, on April 23, a day I will never forget, April 23, 1993—we euphemistically call it Black Friday in Timiskaming, and I'm sure in other ridings too it is referred to as that—this college is to be closed one year hence from April 23. This has had a devastating effect in my riding and it's been a very sobering awakening to the agricultural community not only in northern Ontario but also in southwestern Ontario, where Centralia College, located in Huron county, has also been closed.

It's interesting that the member for Huron is here tonight. I, with my colleague Joan Fawcett, have been speaking on behalf of Centralia College also, because

we feel that even though that's not in our ridings and even though we don't have any personal involvement with that, it's part of the agricultural infrastructure of Ontario and it's very necessary that these institutions remain open to do the work of research and development for agricultural technology in which Canada is a leader, expertise in which these community colleges shared, but also to provide our young people with the training they so badly need, not only in farm-oriented agriculture but other industries and occupations and avocations that can come from agricultural training.

There's a lot of different courses we need to be developing in Ontario, and here we have a system of five colleges, community colleges, if you will, with the agricultural bent that could be integrated into other areas of expertise, moving on to technology, maybe being converted into polytechnicals. Now that we've graduated Ryerson Polytech into a university, here was a wonderful opportunity to expand for Ontario a whole network of polytechnical institutions right across this province. I think that would have been a good idea.

What I and my colleagues are asking for is not this slash-and-burn approach that happened on what's euphemistically called "the lost weekend" around here, when cabinet ministers and deputies basically took the slashing pen to institutions and programs right across this province. But sit down and work together, because it's not just your problem over there; it's all of our problem. We all created this problem together, so let's take responsibility collectively for it and work together on finding a way to get ourselves out of this mess. We all want to get out of this mess and I think we can do it constructively, but to do that we need to take a bit of time. It took us about 120 years to get here, and we're not going to do it overnight. We're not going to do it in six months or over this next remaining fiscal year, the nine months that are left, and we're not going to do it in the three years over which the social contract legislation takes an effect by just freezing salaries, taking back maybe 12 days a year.

This is not going to be good enough. This is not the type of reinventing government, that I want to talk about in the concluding statements, that's really going to do it. This is just tinkering with it a little bit, this is just fine-tuning, and we're at the point where now we need to do more than that. We need radical surgery. We can work together in doing that instead of this slash-and-burn approach.

The other thing that got changed with the announcements of the first \$2 billion in cutbacks that happened on April 23 was the cancellation of most of the relocation of government jobs that were scheduled to happen right across this province. Mr Speaker, as you know, the previous government had announced quite a bold and innovative program that started in northern Ontario. Basically the Peterson Liberal government had said,

why should all the government jobs, as good as they may be, be centred primarily in Toronto and the GTA, the greater Toronto region? Why shouldn't all the taxpayers of Ontario benefit more directly and more equitably from the jobs that accrue from the tax revenue that we bring in as government?

2320

So we started in northern Ontario. We moved the Ministry of Correctional Services to North Bay. We moved the Ministry of Northern Development, which, gee, was a kind of wild idea, to northern Ontario—not a bad idea; kind of made sense. That's in Sudbury. We moved a great section of the Ministry of Natural Resources that deals with forestry research and technology to Sault Ste Marie. We also moved some aspects of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to Thunder Bay.

So what we started to do with the major centres of northern Ontario, with Timmins we moved some jobs of the Ministry of Transportation, basically the five major centres in northern Ontario got sort of a piece of the action, if you will, of the Ontario government so that we had some of that payroll that all Ontarians contribute to the civil service to keep those services coming to the people of Ontario; these were distributed a little more fairly, starting to give back some of that resource to the people of northern Ontario.

One advantage, also, that accrued from that was not only just getting a sort of a solid underpinning to the economy of some of these towns, but what we had also for the very first time was a new layer of bureaucracy that lived and breathed in northern Ontario. People who experienced the north in their daily workings understood the problems and the concerns of northern Ontarians. As these people moved around, and many of them as they went to other head offices in Toronto later on had developed that northern Ontario experience. So it made it much, much easier for the 15 to 16 of us, who are representing all three political parties, from northern Ontario, when we come down to Toronto to deal with the ministries and the civil servants that work in those ministries, that these people had northern experience.

So the same idea was decided, that we would do this with the rest of the province. So we decided to move a ministry to Windsor and to move an agency of government to Chatham and do the same to St Catharines, Niagara Falls, Brantford, Peterborough and to one in my riding, Haileybury, that had been very hard hit with the closing of mills and mines in my area about four years ago.

So we had a even distribution of government jobs out of Toronto right across the southwest, the east and, again, into the north. Unfortunately, on April 23, 1993, most of that program was cancelled. That's really hurt the province of Ontario very, very badly. That's a dream that I'm certainly not letting go. I hope some day



when the government does change that this dream can still be alive, and maybe some of those job relocations won't be as big because government won't be as big, and that's okay. It would be nice to have the number of jobs that were out there before, but as we downsize government, future relocations, if they are to happen, won't be as big also. But I hope we can continue with that dream and get that fair distribution of government jobs right across the province.

One thing I've noticed that so far in this House people haven't talked about is the position of the Conservatives. I'm glad to see that my good friend Al McLean, the member for—Simcoe West, I believe, Mr McLean?

**Mr McLean:** Simcoe East.

**Mr Ramsay:** —Simcoe East is here, because I certainly want to talk about the Tory record on the social contract, because it has sort of been flipping and flopping all over the place, and we're certainly going to be interested to see what the Tories do tomorrow, actually, which way they go on this piece of legislation.

Mike Harris, the leader of the Tories, has been all over the map on this thing, and I've got a few quotes here to say where he started off. He was very much in favour at the start. On April 14, and this is recorded in Hansard, he said, "I applauded the initial announcement that you were going to talk with public sector employees and with the representatives of a million of them." So he thought this was really good. He said: "I will support,"—he went on—"you to go even further;"—government, as he said to them—"you know that as well. I want to state clearly today that I will support legislation—"—and here comes the famous quotation, colleagues, he said—"bang, bang, bang," remember that?

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Who said that?

**Mr Ramsay:** Mike Harris said that.

**Mr Bradley:** Was he supporting it?

**Mr Ramsay:** Well, we don't know, I say to the member for St Catharines. He's asking me if the Tories are going to support this. We're not sure what he's going to do.

He said, "Bang, bang, bang, first, second, third reading—one day past a realistic deadline."

**Mr Bradley:** Well, I think Stockwell is against it.

**Mr Ramsay:** Well, that's what we're going to see, if all the Tories support this or not. It's going to be interesting. But then he said legislation isn't needed. He said this, now, on June 7. So this is only about two weeks later and this is what Mr Harris said: "I presented you and your Treasurer with a fourth option...There's a three-year plan and natural attrition, with a hiring freeze. It would mean a permanent downsizing of government, no unnecessary layoffs, enough flexibility

to ensure priority services are maintained, and quite frankly, no legislation is even required to implement that one."

**Mr Bradley:** So what happens when a fireman retires?

**Mr Ramsay:** Well, that's what we have to know and that's part of the problem. Unfortunately, the Tories have some very simplistic answers to some of this, saying, "All you have to do is completely freeze the hiring of the civil service."

**Mr Bradley:** Well, you have to replace the fireman, surely.

**Mr Ramsay:** It sounds kind of good, but as my friend from St Catharines says, "What do you do when a firefighter retires?"—I like to use that expression "firefighter" for my colleague—and a police officer, what do you do when that person retires? You can't necessarily move these people around from city to city and town to town, and I think that's very important. It sounds very good and somehow simplistic that you create no harm to civil servants by just allowing their natural retirement through attrition and, therefore, by freezing that you can downsize in some natural pattern.

It's not the way to do it because it's impossible to control it and to revive those essential services, because a police person, a firefighter, nurses in hospitals, people like that who retire, especially providing those essential services, they have to be there; you cannot control the change of person power when it comes to that. That simplistic solution is not on.

Anyway, that's what Mike Harris was saying on June 7, but two days later back in the Legislature, and this is on Hansard of June 9 of this year, Mr Harris said: "We told you that your contract talks could not possibly succeed. The union leaders had no chance with credibility to keep their jobs and negotiate rolling back contracts unless three commonsense things were put on the table, unless you were firm on three areas. One, the amount: \$2 billion...Secondly, the deadline...the legislation, the hammer that you plan to bring in." This is Mike Harris on June 9.

On June 14 he said: "I'm serving notice today as well on this piece of legislation that I and my caucus colleagues will be putting forward amendments to this bill." Five days later, bang, bang, bang was back on the shelf and he said: "...retroactive rollbacks, gutting the negotiation process, creating the chaos out there is not the right way to go." Again, that's Mike Harris now on June 14 commenting on the social contract legislation.

It's going to be very interesting to see where the third party, the Progressive Conservative Party, stands on this issue.

I'd like to talk a little bit about why the Liberal caucus will not be supporting this legislation, because I think it's very important to get this across to the

public because, as I said before, we're all very concerned with the deficit. I think what's paramount in all of our minds is that we've got to control government expenditure, but it has got to be done in a fair and realistic way and it's not going to be done overnight. This can't be done overnight if you're to maintain the essential services and you're to maintain the morale of the public service.

In this legislation there's a bit of a ticking time bomb because there's one aspect where 12 days a year are to be basically taken away from these employees in the public service. Maybe some of the people in different ministries are going to be able to survive on 12 days without pay, and maybe in some ministries we're going to be able to survive with maybe some of the services that some of those people provide. We can maybe get away with that on that particular day of the month, but what about firefighters and people that work in the police force, the nurses and all the various essential services out there? What are we going to do with those people?

Well, the legislation addresses that. What it says basically is that those people are going to be able to accumulate that time. They're going to give it up in those years and, in a sense, they're going to have this credit. So over three years they're going to have a credit of 36 days because, of course, the expenditure is going to have to happen this year, next year and the year after that, because, of course, the hospitals have to keep nurses on the go, the fire stations are going to have to keep their people there, and the same with police departments. We're still going to have to have people on the job providing those services.

Meanwhile, those other folks who are supposedly giving up those days have now got this credit they've accumulated of 36 days. After the third year, when this legislation expires and this government, I think, is long gone, this ticking time bomb will now explode, because all these folks out there are going to start to demand those days back, either as days off or, again, we're going to have to be hiring other people to take their duty on those days and, therefore, it's going to be double expenditure, or they're going to be looking for the money. It's probably going to be done by just hiring other people.

We've got this sort of ticking fiscal time bomb out there, it's absolutely irresponsible, and that's one of the main reasons we cannot support this legislation. It is not fair, it's not right to build this time bomb for the future citizens of Ontario and the future government of Ontario. That needs to be, I think, sung loud and clear throughout Ontario so that people understand what's in this legislation. It is terribly flawed. It's going to only start to take care of a bit of a temporary problem but build a bigger problem down the road. I think it's very clear and I would hope that the Conservative Party

voices its opposition to this bill when we vote tomorrow afternoon.

2330

I've outlined the problem a little bit and been fairly negative about this legislation, but I'd like to put forward some proposals right now. I always like to do that since, in public office, even in opposition, it should not be my part just to be negative and to be critical but also to be constructive when one can. I think here is the time to be constructive.

I think the way to be constructive here is to say that we should start to remodel this 18th-century model that we still have of government and many institutions we have in the public sector in this province and this country. Now is the time to do that.

We don't have to look at foreign countries, though there are some good examples. I'm going to talk about that in a second. All we have to do is look down the road and down the street here right here in Toronto at one of our other big institutions in this country: the banks. Here we have some of the most conservative institutions in this country. But the banks use 21st-century technology in their services. You don't necessarily have to line up at a wicket any more to bank. You can still do that if you want, but all you have to do now is use the bank machines. You can use those digital highways that connect those bank machines with the central computers in order to do all sorts of financial transactions today.

All sorts of institutions in our country have moved with modern technology, but government has been one of the slowest to move. That's what we have to do. We have to move with the times. We have to revamp totally our organizations. Government is the place we need to start.

There was a very good book written a few years back by an American, David Osborne, called *Reinventing Government*. From time to time, many members in the House will quote from this book, will quote that phrase. I know many of my colleagues have read this book. I believe very strongly in the process of reinventing government.

Where this came from really started in California about 14 years ago. As you know, in California citizens, through petitioning, can have questions put on a ballot. A referendum can have all sorts of different issues decided upon by the people directly. There was a very famous proposition on the ballot called Proposition 13 that said municipalities must freeze their tax revenues at that rate at that particular year and do with what they had at that particular time.

That's what really gave the impetus, the challenge to communities, starting in California. As most trends in the United States do, it started in the west and moved right across the east, where local, state and now federal



governments in the United States have really been challenged with trying to do more with less.

This book, *Reinventing Government*, is really a compilation of many of the ideas and the successful formulas that have been forged by American legislators and public servants over the last 14 years from the schoolhouse to the statehouse, to city hall, to the Pentagon, as the book says. I wanted to read one little part from this, because I think it applies very directly to the social contract legislation. It's one of the founding principles in this book. It's the third principle they have. It has to deal with public servants.

The author says:

"Third, we believe that the people who work in government are not the problem. The systems in which they work are the problem. We write not to berate public employees but to give them hope. At times it may sound as if we are engaged in bureaucratic bashing, but our intention is to bash bureaucracies and not bureaucrats. We have known thousands of civil servants through the years and most, although certainly not all, have been responsible, talented, dedicated people trapped in archaic systems that frustrate their creativity and sap their energy. But we believe these systems can be changed to liberate the enormous energies of public servants and to heighten their ability to serve the public."

I believe that too. I believe that's possible to accomplish here in Ontario. I would think it would be a very constructive process for this government to start to maybe invite the opposition parties to join it in some sort of committee of reinventing government. I think that would be a great way to get all three parties working together, something that really in a way is quite non-partisan, and maybe start that sense of cooperation between all three parties, because we all agree there's a problem.

I think we all have a sense of where we need to go. You have a bill called the capital corporations bill that I happen to agree with. I think that's the start of reinventing government. You're proposing some capital corporations that could do some new and very creative and innovative ways of providing public service. That's a good start. I for one in the opposition support that. Why don't we work together on some sort of all-party committee where we could look at other ideas for that? I think that's the way we bring parties together and maybe bring some of our ideas together.

We've got to start to look at government that's driven by the customers and not by bureaucrats or just by politicians. We have to realize the taxpayer out there is also the shareholder here. We owe her and him the benefit of all that we can do and all the best we can do here in government.

I think by working together that's what we're going

to do. I think what we need to be doing is not worrying about necessarily all the flaws we have here but let's start being positive. Let's start saying, "We will work together to build better government here in Ontario." I put out that invitation to the NDP government. Let's start working together to build better government for the people of Ontario.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Timiskaming for his contribution to this debate and invite questions and/or comments. The member for St Catharines.

**Mr Bradley:** I was very pleased to hear the member for Timiskaming deal with these matters in such a reasonable way. He's recognized that while most of the province is in favour of restraint, efficiency and cooperation in terms of finding better ways to deliver services for government, he recognizes that this bill is a very impractical bill and that the consequences of the legislation at the end of three years are such that many people are going to be very concerned in terms of the dollars and cents that are going to be accumulating at that time.

I, of course, am still interested in seeing how the Conservative Party is going to vote on this. I've been waiting. I know there's been some considerable discussion in the Progressive Conservative caucus. My friend the member for Simcoe East is here this evening. I'm sure he'd like to oppose this bill. Even though all of us are in favour of the general restraint that we see in the province, I think many in the Progressive Conservative Party see the deficiencies in this particular bill and ultimately will be voting against it.

They will also see that with the number of members on the other side who, in principle, are opposed to what we would find in this bill, we're likely to see those people stand up on principle and oppose this bill and vote against it. So the opportunity is there for the Progressive Conservative Party to help defeat this government, something that many people in this province would like to see happen.

I'll be watching very carefully to see tomorrow, when the vote takes place or whenever it takes place, how that will finally turn out. But I thought the speech by the member for Timiskaming was very reasonable, very balanced and presented, for members of the assembly and those who are staying up late tonight to watch this, the kind of arguments that are very compelling and very relevant to this case.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Ottawa Centre.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I understood the member from Timiskaming to say that his mother was watching this evening. I also understood him to say, while his mother was watching, that the debt of the province had doubled in the last three years. That is incorrect. I would not like the mother of the member from Timiskaming to go

away with a false impression. In fact, she will be able to add up, if he cannot, the deficits that have been incurred by this government since we came to office.

It started at a level of \$40 billion, I'll remind the member from Timiskaming, when we took over from the party he represents, as government. We had a deficit of \$11 billion in 1991-92. It was \$12 billion in 1992-93. It is projected to be \$9 billion this year. This does not a doubling make.

**Mr McLean:** I wanted to say a few words with regard to the comments the member for Timiskaming made. I want to commend him on some of the aspects of his remarks, especially those related to: Perhaps we should be thinking of not what we can get out of this country but what we can put back in to make it a better country to live in. He referred that back to some 40 or 50 years, but I don't think he has to go back that far.

From the rural community that I come from, when the neighbours helped one another when you had a disaster such as I had on June 2, 1964, when I lost my barn by fire, the neighbours helped. It put me back on my feet again. Those are the types of things that communities did.

2340

I think that was what he was referring to in his remarks, although I didn't hear too many referrals made to how we should change this legislation that would make it better, that they would appreciate it and that they would be able to support it. From what I've observed, it's strictly that they're going to oppose it, not really giving any alternatives.

My leader has said—and he's wondering how we're going to vote—that what he wanted to do was to freeze the wages and freeze the hiring. He wanted to make sure that those who had agreements and contracts signed would not be dealt with until they ran out and then they would be three years after that.

We want some amendments to this legislation and we look forward to some of the ones which my leader has put forward, and there are six of them. What they were saying was we believe that there's got to be restraint. We know there's a need for restraint. I think every member in this Legislature knows there's a need for restraint. How you go about doing it, we probably have different ideas of how we should do it, but we have alternatives. Bang, bang, we have alternatives. But I haven't seen the Liberals give us any alternatives, and that's what concerns me when you get up and just oppose without having something as an alternative. I say we need an alternative and my leader is willing to put that forward.

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I want to commend the member for Timiskaming for his fine words and certainly agree with him as far as his remarks referring to agriculture. I too can commiserate with him.

He knows very well the New Liskeard scene where the agricultural college has been removed, and I guess I can't say it was a pleasure to attend the rally at Centralia where that college is also being wiped off the map and to listen to the various students whose education is now in jeopardy and those who were planning to go.

Really, it's inconceivable to understand why this government would cut out something that really—graduates from the college at Centralia, and I'm sure this is the same for New Liskeard, are 85% assured of a job when they leave that college. This government pretends to say that it really is interested in jobs, and yet we really wonder if it is.

I also have to agree with the member. I too find it absolutely amazing how the members of the Conservative Party are going to seemingly support the government in this social contract and really help them to pass this legislation. In my riding the number one worry is jobs, and really, the number one question is how much longer we have to put up with this NDP government and how we can get rid of them.

I've said that should a non-confidence motion occur such as the social contract might provide—and here we have the Conservative members who will support them and help them pass it. There we go, another chance passed.

**The Speaker:** The member for Timiskaming has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Ramsay:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, because I guess I owe it to my mother to comment on what the member for Ottawa had said, and I must thank her. I've added up all the figures and I must say, the member's probably right, it's not exactly double. It's very close. We're looking at about from \$38 billion to \$40 billion.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** We're working on it.

**Mr Ramsay:** Yes, you certainly are working on doubling it. You'll be there soon. You've probably added about \$35 billion to it, so it's pretty close, Mom, and that's what I had to say anyway, so it wasn't that far off. But I appreciate the member bringing that to my attention for sure.

I appreciate the comments on this debate and I appreciate members recognizing when members are trying to be constructive at times. I would really take seriously that offer I put forward that I think reinventing what we do is really the way we need to start to approach government for sure and starting to be facilitators. As the people in the book say, be steerers rather than rowers, rather than always providing services.

I think you're starting to see that too, as I said, with some of your legislation that I support. Capital corps are a good start. We can work together and find other methods of starting to facilitate in society rather than



always having to provide the service directly.

I think there are a lot of services that maybe we could start to look at, and maybe we don't have to provide any more and we should start to look at those things. Maybe there are some services that are still essential that maybe other people can provide, and maybe those services we feel are so basic and fundamental to government that we are going to remain providing those services but maybe that's the area we need to look at, providing those services in a new way, maybe a new, creative and imaginative and cost-effective and efficient way.

That's what we have to start to look at. It's really a tremendous challenge there for us, and I think just saying we're going to cut back on this or slash on this without sort of, I guess, applying some creativity and some new ideas is really the wrong way to go. We're entering a new technological age. There are a lot of tremendous new methods that we could be applying to administer government in this country, and I think that's the challenge that's before us.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate? I recognize the honourable member for York North.

**Mr Beer:** Thank you.

*Applause.*

**Mr Beer:** I suspect the clapping is because we are getting close to the magic hour of midnight.

I would just like to make an announcement at the beginning that I'm practically 100% sure that my mother is not watching, and if she is, Mother, go to bed, where the rest of us should be.

Mr Speaker, it is late, and we are, I suspect, nearing the end at least of part of this debate, and I think it is important to recognize that in, I think, the vast majority of the presentations that have been made by members on both sides of the House and among all three parties, there has been an attempt to put forward the various arguments both for and against the bill and I suppose for some of the viewers sitting at home, particularly at this late hour, trying to sort out what this is all about?

It seems to me there are three major things that we've been dealing with this spring. One is the social contract, and we now have the bill before us. The other was the expenditure control plan that the government put forward, and the third has been the government's budget.

I think it is clear that all members in this House support the direction that this government wants to go in terms of reducing the deficit and moving towards cutting back on the debt.

But I think it's also important to underline that in the role of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, one of the things that we need to do is to look very carefully at the means by which these ends are going to be realized and that, in our view, as has been stated by my leader, Mrs

McLeod, and by various others, when we look at what it is that this bill is intended to do, when we look at what it is supposed to achieve, in our view it can't achieve those objectives and indeed it is an unworkable bill and what it will leave at the end of the three-year period during which it is supposed to work is a situation for whatever party forms the next government, whether it's the present government, the Conservative Party or the Liberals. It is going to leave an extremely difficult situation where, in our view, there will be many, many deferred costs, with a potential cost overall of billions of dollars, that simply are going to mean that the cure that the government is offering is in fact worse than the disease.

I think when a political party comes to that conclusion, then what one has to do is to say, "Look, these are the reasons why we can't support the bill." It is, I hope, going to be going to committee, where we're going to be able to hear from witnesses, to go through it very carefully on a clause-by-clause basis and to set out some of the things which my leader has been setting out in terms of her questioning to the Premier and to the Treasurer, the flaws of the bill and some of the things that simply don't add up.

J'aimerais aussi, ce soir, suggérer quelques commentaires en langue française, parce que je pense qu'il est très important aussi de mettre devant la population les arguments que nous avons sur ce projet de loi. Nous avons dit que nous nous opposerions au projet de loi sur le contrat social parce qu'il est d'abord inapplicable et qu'il ne permettra pas de réaliser les économies prévues de deux milliards de dollars.

**2350**

Nous étions prêts à donner notre appui à un projet de loi sensé — c'est ce que M<sup>me</sup> McLeod a dit à mille reprises — qui permettrait de négocier au palier local et qui réaliserait de véritables compressions. Mais le projet de loi qui a été déposé hier n'atteint aucun de ces objectifs. Tout ce qu'il fait est de créer plus de bouleversements et de confusion.

Alors, la question qui s'impose est : qu'est-ce qui ne fonctionne pas ? Selon nous, le projet de loi contient toute une série de lacunes. D'abord, les dispositions concernant les congés non payés signifient qu'un nombre indéterminé de travailleurs dans les services essentiels pourront accumuler jusqu'à 36 jours de vacances. En fait, il n'y a pas d'économies, seulement un report des coûts jusqu'en 1996.

Deuxièmement, il ne permet pas de véritables négociations locales. Il établit seulement de nouveaux paliers de négociations encombrantes et encore inapplicables.

Troisièmement, les échéances pour les négociations sont irréalistes.

Quatrièmement, le plan de redéploiement de la main-d'oeuvre contenu dans l'offre du contrat final du

gouvernement est impossible à mettre en application, et le projet de loi ne contient pas de solutions en rechange.

Alors depuis avril, soit au début des négociations du contrat social, M<sup>me</sup> McLeod a, maintes fois, demandé au gouvernement de se fixer des objectifs financiers précis, de négocier avec ses propres employés et de donner au secteur public les outils dont il a besoin pour négocier au niveau local.

Nous ne contestons pas la nécessité des compressions, bien que nous ayons exprimé — et nous continuerons de l'exprimer — notre frustration face au fait que deux ans et demi de mauvaise gestion financière nous ont amenés au point où le gouvernement se sent obligé de reprendre ce qu'il a donné avec tant de prodigalité au cours de sa première année.

Alors, là je présente quelques observations pourquoi nous avons dit que nous ne pouvions pas appuyer ce projet de loi que vient de présenter le gouvernement.

There have been a number of documents that have come forward from many of the different sectors, from our transfer payment partners, whether it is education, the municipalities, hospitals, conservation authorities, and again every one of those sectors has said: "Yes, we must cut back. Yes, we must try to exercise restraint." I think many of them have demonstrated that over the last couple of years, because they've been facing cutbacks and they've had to act with those cutbacks.

I was intrigued to see in the publication *Municipal World*, the June 1993 edition, where they had put together a special group to look at the municipal position on the expenditure control plan and social contract proposals. Here we are talking with one of the major sectors of our transfer partners, the municipalities, that argue, and I think can argue with a great deal of strength, that they have been demonstrating the kind of restraint and care with their budgets that this government has not with its.

The first statement this group of municipalities makes is: "We do support the government's determination to reduce its deficit. Secondly, we are strongly committed to working with the government to reduce total public sector expenditures through fundamental restructuring that will relieve the burden on our common taxpayer on a permanent basis." But the third point they make is, "We do not accept the timing, magnitude and approach of either the expenditure control plan or the social contract cuts to the municipal sector."

They then go on in this article, and indeed in the publication, to set out a number of proposals and to make suggestions to the government much in the same way that the public service coalition had also proposed some optional proposals to the government. We might not agree with all of them, but none the less they put those forward.

The public boards and the separate boards have made

proposals in terms of what they believe could be done. The conservation authorities have also done the same thing. I think the concern that all those sectors have had is that nobody was really listening.

Here it was within the process of the whole social contract that there was a sense that the participants were being devalued. I don't say that the government set out to do that, but that was the sense. For anyone who walked by that room, with all of the different employer and employee groups that were there, there was just a sense that this was not really a collective bargaining process that in fact could lead anywhere.

As my leader said on so many occasions, what we needed was a plan that had begun far earlier, probably last fall, and was going to focus on a sector-by-sector basis, where the government would begin with its own employees, where the education sector would deal with itself and the municipal sector with itself, by all means having broad parameters set out by the provincial government in terms of where it was felt, and where it was thought we had to go. But that wasn't done, so now we're in a situation where we have a bill, which as has been mentioned by many people, has a hammer, has a gun, has a sword that comes into play on August 1.

Will it in fact bring about the very ends that the government has said it will? I think this is where we take issue with the government's proposal. Whether I'm talking in terms of my own area of York region, or if I go around to my municipalities in Newmarket, Aurora and King township, whether I'm talking about the two boards in York region or the various hospitals or the south Lake Simcoe conservation authority, having talked to all of them, what I see are people who want to work together but who simply have a feeling that this act will not permit that kind of cooperation, that kind of dialogue or that kind of discussion.

I have a number of other points I would have made, but I understand there has been an agreement by the House leaders that we would complete the debate this evening and that there would be a vote deferred until tomorrow. By prior agreement, I will at this point move adjournment of the debate. I will do whatever will work out, what people have sorted out, so I will just sit down.

**The Speaker:** A wise move. I thank the honourable member for York North for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments. Is there further debate on this bill?

Mr Laughren moves second reading of Bill 48. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services):** Mr Speaker, before you call in the members, I believe we do have



unanimous consent to defer the vote until following routine proceedings tomorrow.

**The Speaker:** Do we have unanimous agreement to defer the vote on second reading of Bill 48 until tomorrow following routine proceedings? Agreed. Accordingly, the vote on Bill 48, second reading, will occur immediately following routine proceedings tomorrow.

Is there a statement of business?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services):** Before I move adjournment of the House, I'd like to indicate the bus-

iness of the House tomorrow: government notice of motion number 5 to extend the sittings beyond June 24; Bill 102, pay equity; Bills 32 and 34, vehicle transfer; all Pr bills; Bill 29, second reading, to eliminate the commercial concentration tax.

With that, Mr Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** It being 12 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 2400.







## CONTENTS

Tuesday 22 June 1993

### SECOND READINGS

#### **Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48**

Mr Villeneuve . . . . .	1787, 1792
Mr Callahan . . . . .	1791, 1793, 1798
Mr Mammoliti . . . . .	1792
Mr McLean . . . . .	1797, 1798, 1804, 1815, 1830, 1838
Mr White . . . . .	1803, 1811, 1820
Mr Daigeler . . . . .	1803, 1806, 1807, 1812
Mr Arnott . . . . .	1803
Mr Tilson . . . . .	1803
Mr Mackenzie . . . . .	1804, 1807
Mr Stockwell . . . . .	1806, 1812, 1816
Mr Hope . . . . .	1806, 1831
Mr Cleary . . . . .	1807, 1831
Mrs O'Neill . . . . .	1811, 1815
Mrs Witmer . . . . .	1816
Mr Henderson . . . . .	1817, 1820
Ms Haeck . . . . .	1819
Mr Beer . . . . .	1820, 1825, 1839
Mr Murphy . . . . .	1821, 1826, 1831
Mr Eddy . . . . .	1825, 1827, 1832
Mr McGuinty . . . . .	1826
Mr Ramsay . . . . .	1826, 1832, 1838
Mr Bradley . . . . .	1837
Ms Gigantes . . . . .	1837
Mrs Fawcett . . . . .	1838

### OTHER BUSINESS

#### **Business of the House**

Mr Christopherson . . . . .	1841
-----------------------------	------

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 22 juin 1993

### DEUXIÈME LECTURE

#### **Loi de 1993 sur le contrat social, projet de loi 48**

M. Beer . . . . .	1839
-------------------	------



No. 37A



N° 37A

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 23 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 23 juin 1993



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Wednesday 23 June 1993

The House met at 1334.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' EXPENDITURES

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I beg to inform the House I have today laid upon the table the members' expenditure report for the fiscal year 1992-93. The members will find a copy in their desks in the chamber.

#### REPORT, COMMISSION ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I beg to inform the House I have today laid upon the table the report of the Commission on Conflict of Interest Ontario regarding Mr Will Ferguson, MPP.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS TRANSFER PAYMENTS

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** The Premier and the Minister of Finance have cancelled a party in Brampton, a fireworks display that takes place on Canada's birthday, July 1. It has been going on for years. The reason is that with Bill 48, its uncertainty and its obvious challengeability in the courts, municipalities and other transfer partners do not know what is coming down the pipe. They are therefore taking steps to eliminate such things as the fireworks on July 1. This is a tremendous event. It's a free event. It's a family event. Mr Premier, Mr Finance Minister, you should be ashamed of doing that to the people of Brampton, and I'm sure this will occur throughout Ontario.

More important is the fact that the children's aid societies, which are bound by statute to look after the protection of young children, are going to have difficulty in terms of carrying this out because of this uncertainty. I suggest, Mr Premier and Mr Finance Minister, your bill is so uncertain that I'm sure it will find its way to the Supreme Court of Canada. In the meantime, transfer partners, a whole host of them that are listed in the bill, will be dangling in the air trying to figure out what to do. At the end of the day this government will leave the next government a mess that will take years and years to clean up and further uncertainty.

#### SALE OF FISH

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** My statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources and it concerns the Midland fish shop dealer, Ray Brennan, who was fined \$11,000 when he was caught in a government sting operation in 1988.

Mr Brennan was charged by MNR undercover agents for selling fish caught by unlicensed fishermen from the nearby reserve on Christian Island. Mr Brennan pleaded guilty soon after the charges were laid on June 2. The eight native fishermen were acquitted of 108 charges of illegal commercial fishing. The natives argued that the

Indians in central Ontario have an aboriginal right to fish in waters surrounding their reserves.

Minister, your government is sending out mixed signals. On one hand, your government is allowing native fishermen to catch and sell fish without a commercial fishing licence. On the other hand, you are charging, convicting and fining non-native fish dealers for selling fish caught by unlicensed native fishermen. Mr Brennan and many other people in Ontario are wondering how you can justify such an unfair law.

Minister, you and your government have an obligation to honour the principles of fish and wildlife conservation and to apply and enforce existing laws equally. I urge you to either appeal the June 2 court decision or overturn Mr Brennan's sentence and give him his money back.

#### EMANCIPATION CELEBRATIONS

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** I rise today to bring to the attention of the members of the House a unique event which is taking place in Niagara-on-the-Lake next month. From July 9 to July 11 the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the signing of Upper Canada's anti-slavery legislation, the Emancipation Act.

The man who made this possible was Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe. Simcoe's legacy to our province and to our country is documented in many a history book and we, as modern-day legislators, are certainly reminded of his contribution to our legislative history each day as we sit here in the House. As Upper Canada's first Lieutenant Governor, Simcoe was determined to create a society patterned on the image of Great Britain. He founded the first Legislature and enacted a series of laws, including one to provide for the gradual abolition of slavery.

Prior to the legislation, black slaves had no legal or civil rights. This appalled Simcoe and he instructed his Attorney General to prepare a law to abolish slavery, the first such law in the British Empire. Two hundred years later, we are gathering to pay tribute to Simcoe's actions in advance of black civil rights in Upper Canada.

1340

Many people in Niagara have been busy over the last year making preparations for this commemorative event. Highlights of the week's activities include a re-enactment of the passage of the anti-slavery legislation, a lecture series on Simcoe's legislative legacy, a blues-jazz concert, a revival church service and gospel choir in Simcoe Park and black history displays at the local community centre.

I invite all members to attend what I think is an

extremely important event for Niagara and for our entire country.

#### TAX AND FEE INCREASES

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** I honestly don't think this government has any idea what impact its increase in stumpage fees of some 43% will have on the forestry industry in northern Ontario.

When my leader rose to ask a question regarding this bizarre tax increase to the Premier yesterday, he passed it on to my northern friend the Minister of Finance, the member representing the northern riding of Nickel Belt. His response was totally—I totally—unacceptable.

In an area of the province where unemployment lingers around 16%, how can this government justify such a move that will have such an impact on the jobs which northerners depend on?

I, representing a riding largely dependent on the sawmill industry, call upon that great number of northern ministers—the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Northern Development and Mines, the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Finance—to give their heads a shake, listen to what northerners are telling them and take a close look at what this additional tax grab will do to the sawmill industry in my riding, in their ridings and throughout northern Ontario.

Let me quote to them a letter directed to the Minister of Natural Resources from an operator in my riding. He indicates:

"These additional charges will strangle the small operators. The Minister of Finance obviously went for a tax grab but did not take into the account the impact on employment or whether the industry could afford the extra expense."

I truly believe that the impact of this significant tax grab was never even thought about. I again appeal to this government to re-examine this portion of its budget.

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Last week the Minister of Health quietly introduced legislation which has broad implications for patients who access Ontario's health care system.

While the current minister and her predecessor rail against the evils of rationing health care, Bill 50 will empower bureaucrats to make arbitrary decisions on what health care services will be insured and how often a patient can receive treatment.

Simply put, this legislation will facilitate the further rationing of health care services. But instead of the public and health care professionals determining what services should be insured, it will now be left to Dr Ruth and faceless bureaucrats at the Ministry of Health to make these critical decisions.

There will be no limits on what services can be

restricted by the government. As Ontario Medical Association president Tom Dickson said: "It's not just psychotherapy or eye examinations as originally proposed. The power to ration insured and medically necessary services applies to everyone and to everything."

In her response to the valid concerns raised by the medical community, the Health minister claims that Bill 50 is an extension of her government's reform policies. She's half right. These proposals follow the government's panicky pattern of gutting services without regard for the consequences. They represent changes made out of desperation and not meaningful health care reform.

While my party supports restraint initiatives achieved through managed change, we don't endorse the government's continuing slash-and-burn approach to health care. Instead of bashing doctors, the minister should be seeking their assistance on how to obtain savings without endangering the quality and accessibility of Ontario health care.

#### METROPOLITAN AGENCIES REPRESENTATIVES' COUNCIL

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting with a group called MARC, the Metropolitan Agencies Representatives' Council.

MARC is an association of non-profit agencies in Metropolitan Toronto that share a common commitment to provide high-quality services for persons with developmental handicaps. Their agencies are diverse in size, structure and mandate but work collectively to address common issues and concerns. MARC believes that all persons with developmental handicaps have the right to receive services that most appropriately address their needs and ensure the highest possible quality of life.

Priority issues such as children's services, case management, housing, day activities, human resources and mental health services for persons with developmental handicaps are addressed through the establishment of MARC task forces and subcommittees. Working closely with the Ministry of Community and Social Services is important to MARC. Ministry staff actively participate on most MARC committees and projects and currently co-chair a task force on case management.

There are nearly 50 member agencies of MARC including Bloorview Children's Hospital, the Metropolitan Toronto Association for Community Living, Community Living Alternatives Scarborough, Extend-A-Family, Safehaven and We Four Homes for the Developmentally Handicapped.

MARC combines planning and action to ensure sufficient high-quality services in Metropolitan Toronto for persons with developmental handicaps and their families, and I commend it for its hard work.



Also, I would take the opportunity to introduce a good friend of mine by the name of Darron Bunt. At 10 years of age, she is an active member of the anti-poverty movement in Toronto. She is a student of the political system and is quite looking forward to coming and serving this Legislature at some point.

#### NORTHERN EDUCATION SERVICES

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** Does this government care about the north?

Last week I had the opportunity to visit different parts of northwestern Ontario to meet with school board trustees and administrators, teachers, parents and students. They all raised a number of concerns regarding the provision of education in the north, and there was one point that everyone raised: When will the Minister of Education release his final report of the northern education project?

The northern education project was established in January 1991. It was to undertake an in-depth study of providing educational services to meet the needs of small and isolate boards in northern Ontario.

In June of last year, the project released a consultation report summarizing its findings. This preliminary report dealt with curriculum services and teacher in-service, special education services, supervisory services, finance and capital services and a section on educational governance issues. Upon the release of this report last June, responses were requested by September 30, 1992. A final report was to be ready by the end of last year.

The northern educational community continues to wait for action by this government. Why has the report not been released? Are the expenditure controls and the social contract going to eliminate bringing about important reforms to improve northern education? There is real concern in the north that this Minister of Education and Training and this government plan to do nothing.

Minister, it's time to release the final report of the northern education project and to set out what specific actions you are prepared to take.

#### VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I'm rising to ask for the personal intervention of the Solicitor General of Ontario with respect to a small volunteer fire department in an unorganized municipality in my riding, Laurier township.

The Laurier local services board has made several representations through Mr Jim O'Connor, the chairman of the board, to the Ontario fire marshal's office.

The background behind this is that there was a family, Mr and Mrs Robert Davies, whose home was totally destroyed last year by fire because the fire could not be responded to in view of the fact that there was not a volunteer fire department able to service the area.

Despite the fact that Laurier township has less than 300 permanent residents, they have organized a 24-person volunteer fire department. They have also raised some \$18,000 in cash and pledges, plus land to be donated to the construction of a firehall. These 300 people have also undertaken to purchase themselves, without government help, a used pumper truck. They were given a verbal commitment by Mr Bill Bowman of the Ontario fire marshal's office in North Bay that the ministry would be forthcoming with some \$15,000 as its contribution to equip and build the firehall.

In spite of that fact, in spite of the fact that the municipality and local residents have done their homework so a disaster like the Davies home never occurs again, the Ministry of the Solicitor General is now renegeing on its commitment.

#### OSHAWA FIESTA

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I am pleased to rise today to tell you of Oshawa's 32nd annual Fiesta celebration, which is going on this week. Fiesta is a celebration of ethnic and cultural diversity sponsored by the Oshawa Folk Art Council and supported by such groups as the Ukrainian Youth Association, the Hungarian Cultural Club and Club Carib, to name but a few.

The Fiesta is organized by the citizens of Oshawa and area and is intended for the enjoyment of the people. There's no government funding or organization involved. There are approximately 18 pavilions located throughout the city, each hosted by different social, cultural and ethnic groups. These pavilions operate through Fiesta Week, this week, offering glimpses of the host culture through food, drink, music, dancing and craftwork.

From the parade and concert to the crowning of Miss Fiesta, culminating in the teddy bear picnic, this week-long festival is fun filled, with the most racial, cultural and ethnic harmony. It acknowledges the value of heritage while celebrating the richness of our Canadian society.

I've had the privilege on many occasions of attending, along with my colleague from Oshawa, the reviewing of the parade and the opening day concerts as well as all the pavilions, have enjoyed some excellent dishes, watched young people dance and even quaffed a pint or two of brew.

At a time when the challenges of modern life are pressing upon us, Fiesta is a welcome respite, and I welcome the people here to join us in Oshawa for this coming celebration.

1350

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to welcome to our gallery this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, Mr André Bertouille, a

member of the Belgium Parliament, and Mr Claude Rijmenans, the consul general for Belgium. Welcome to our assembly.

We are also joined today by one of the officers of the assembly, the Honourable Judge Evans, the commissioner for conflict of interest. He too is seated in the Speaker's gallery.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PROCESS

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** Mr Speaker, I have a point of order, and it's possibly as well a point of personal privilege. It arises in connection with Bill 48, the Social Contract Act. Specifically, my point of order relates to the highly unusual and unprecedented degree to which Bill 48 authorizes cabinet to make what are fundamentally important and substantive laws by way of regulation.

There is no doubt that it is within the mandate of any government to introduce legislation which contains within it a provision enabling cabinet to make regulations. This happens all the time and is generally supportable. But I submit to you, Mr Speaker, that this tradition has been based on the premise that the legislation itself is to contain the substantive elements incorporating a government's policy, while the regulation-making authority is merely for purposes of facilitating the implementation of the substantive provisions; the regulatory provisions are not to be used for purposes of enacting substantive government policy.

This legislative tradition has evolved over centuries of parliamentary democracy. Like many other traditions we follow and respect in this Legislature, this particular legislative tradition has evolved in recognition of the cornerstone of our parliamentary democracy: that government policy must be subjected to public debate.

A regulation is, as we all know, not subject to debate in this Legislature; in fact, it is not even subject to debate by the caucus of the governing party. A regulation is passed by a cabinet whose meetings are secret. There is no opportunity for members of my party, the official opposition, or for members of the third party to debate the wisdom of a particular regulation, and by and large we accept that. We accept that very severe curtailment of our right to debate a legislative enactment of the government because of the bargain implicit in the tradition to which I have been referring.

The bargain is simply put thus: Members of the opposition are not permitted to debate a regulation arising from the bill which has become law, because the government's regulation is not permitted to embody substantive government policy but merely facilitates the implementation of that policy.

I submit, Mr Speaker, that Bill 48, as it stands, is in breach of the tradition regarding a government's authority to make regulations; it goes outside the bargain made between the opposition and the government.

The following are some specific examples of how, by way of regulation, Bill 48 will enable the government to enact substantive policy and thereby avoid the scrutiny of this House. Let me begin by saying that Bill 48 is generally regarded as the most intrusive wage control legislation ever introduced in this country. It is a very controversial bill. The provisions are powerful and far-reaching and will have a profound impact on many Ontarians and their government-funded institutions. This, I submit, makes it all the more important that the bill respect the parliamentary tradition, or bargain, relating to regulatory provisions.

Subsection 41(1), dealing with the regulations, provides in part as follows, that "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make such regulations as the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers necessary or advisable for carrying out the intent and purposes of this act." This provision alone gives the cabinet virtually unrestricted authority to make whatever regulations it, subjectively speaking, deems to be necessary or advisable.

Now, what you, Mr Speaker, or my party or the third party or the government considers to be necessary or advisable in given circumstances may very well be four different things, and of course only the government's opinion can win the day. The government is entitled to win the day, but only where a substantive law has been subjected to public debate.

There is, objectively speaking, no restriction whatsoever in section 41 on the kind of regulations the government can pass. If the government determines, subjectively, that it is necessary or desirable to enact a regulation which, objectively speaking, is clearly a matter of substantive law, then it can do so with impunity, without exposing such a regulation to public debate. Clearly, such a provision runs contrary to the parliamentary tradition or bargain about which I have been speaking.

In addition, section 41 allows the government to designate, by way of regulation, other employers not listed in the schedule for the bill that would then be bound by the bill's provisions. Is this not a substantive question? Surely the employers to be affected by Bill 48 should be made known to us now and this issue should be subjected to debate.

Section 41 also specifically permits the cabinet subjectively to define any word or expression used in the bill. Again, this enables the government to interpret the bill, once it becomes law, in a manner which could very well be contrary to what an objective interpretation would dictate.

This list is lengthy, Mr Speaker, but I submit the few following as being other examples of where Bill 48 permits substantive law to be passed by cabinet in secret, without public debate, by way of regulation.



The size of the public sector job security fund and its operation will be dictated by regulation. So would the question of which employers will be required to pay money into the consolidated revenue fund, the amount of money and the method and time for payment to be made. In addition, there is the question about to whom the minister can delegate any of his powers under the act and to whom these persons can, in turn, subdelegate their powers.

I submit that Bill 48 is, in large measure, a law which allows cabinet to pass other laws. These other laws or regulations will, because of their substantive policy nature, go outside the traditional scope of regulations.

I submit, Mr Speaker, that it is beyond the power of this government to introduce Bill 48 in its present form and I ask that you compel the government to withdraw Bill 48 or, failing that, that you in some way ensure that my rights and the rights of the other opposition members of this House to debate substantive government policy be protected.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Having heard what my colleague said, Mr Speaker, I would refer you to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, section 106(k), which clearly state:

"Regulations should not contain provisions initiating new policy, but should be confined to details to give effect to the policy established by the statute;

"Regulations should be in strict accord with the statute conferring of power, particularly concerning personal liberties;

"Regulations should be expressed in precise and unambiguous language;

"Regulations should not have retrospective effect unless clearly authorized by statute;

"Regulations should not impose a fine, imprisonment or other penalty."

I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to look at that in light of the comments my colleague has made. I would submit that Bill 48 is in contravention, if anything, of the standing orders of the Legislature, section 106(k).

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Mr Speaker, I'm just seeking from you an opportunity to speak on the same point of order raised by my friend from Ottawa South and spoken to as well by my friend from Brampton.

For a period of five years while our party was in government, I had the privilege and the opportunity of serving as the chair of the cabinet committee on regulations. The responsibility of the chair in that cabinet committee was to examine every single regulation proposed for enactment by the government, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, prior to that regulation going before cabinet. I should tell you two main features of the work of that cabinet committee on behalf of

the cabinet. The first was to ensure that the authority to make the regulation existed in the statute, in the law that the Parliament, this Parliament, had previously passed. Regulations, as you know, cannot be made until there is an empowering statute, an empowering law, an empowering act that gives the authority to the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the cabinet to make a regulation which then has the force of law, every bit as much as a law passed by this Parliament has the force of law.

Our first objective—and this is a long-standing tradition in the Parliament—was to make sure that the authority to make the regulation existed in the act passed by Parliament.

That was crucial, because if it were ever found by a court that there was not the power to make the regulation, then as a result of that, the regulation itself was ultra vires and did not have the force of law. Obviously, you had to ensure that was the case, because after the regulation is published and proclaimed, citizens of the province rely on it: everything from the setting of GO fares to the setting of very sophisticated environmental regulations. That's the first point.

**1400**

The second point, and the point that is germane to the matter raised by my friend from Ottawa South, is this: It was imperative upon us to ensure that the regulation being made was not in fact establishing policy or establishing matters of law that were not contemplated in the bill; that is to say, the regulation-making power of the government and the cabinet could not replace the authority of Parliament to pass bills that set public policy in the province of Ontario.

If a regulation came before my cabinet committee, and thereafter the cabinet, which attempted to usurp the power that is vested in this Parliament, our responsibility as a cabinet committee and as a cabinet was to reject it and to advise the appropriate minister and the appropriate ministry that if that minister or ministry wanted to achieve that end, to establish those laws, then it was his or her responsibility to introduce a bill in this Legislature and have it go through the legislative procedure of being read three times and being considered by one of the committees of this Legislature or the committee of the whole, including, time and again, and often, public hearings so that the public would have an opportunity to consider that bill.

If a regulation came which was really the establishment of new public policy not contemplated by the bill, or if the effect of the regulation was to go beyond the bill, then it was our responsibility to reject it. It could not be sealed and it could not become law in Ontario.

I have personally read, several times, Bill 48, the so-called Social Contract Act, and I simply want to advise you, sir, that given my experience as Chair of that regulations committee and my experience with the

legislation that we are called upon to vote today, the power vested in the cabinet is actually power to write new laws that ought properly to be the subject of a bill in this Parliament, and not regulations.

I ask you, sir, to consider that matter, and before this bill proceeds, to ensure that we do not allow this Parliament simply to give the authority that we have and vest that in the secrecy of cabinet and put all the power in this province in the hands of a Premier and a Minister of Finance.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Just one very brief comment on the very interesting point that's been raised on the other side, Mr Speaker, and that's to point out to you, sir, that Bill 48 was drafted by the office of legislative counsel, who have done all the legislative drafting for this establishment for many, many years, and legislative counsel assures us that all—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** As you know, their job is not only to draft but to advise on the legality of the legislative drafting that's requested, and we've been assured by legislative counsel that all the matters dealt with in Bill 48 are in order.

**The Speaker:** First, to the member for Ottawa South, I appreciate the courtesy which he extended to the Chair by indicating in advance his interest in raising a point of order and, indeed, providing me with a verbatim copy of his argument.

I must tell him that it is not a procedural point. There's nothing out of order. The question of governance by regulation has been a topic of some discussion over decades in this assembly and I suspect will continue to be so for many more decades. The points he makes are ones which he may wish to raise in debate, and may wish to place amendments.

The section to which the member for Brampton South refers, 106(k), is one that deals with procedures which are before the standing committee on regulations and private bills when regulations are submitted to that committee for their consideration.

Finally, to the member for York Centre, the points that he raises are ones that very well a counsel, a barrister, a solicitor may wish to raise in the courts. The Chair is not about to give legal opinions, only decisions on procedures. There is nothing out of order.

**Mr Callahan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I refer you to section 1(a) of the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, which the item that I gave you before is part of.

It says, "The proceedings in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and in all committees of the assembly shall be conducted according to the following standing orders."

**The Speaker:** A point was raised. I have dealt with it. It really is time to move on.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier. Today, we will be voting against Bill 48, the government's social contract legislation. For the past weeks, we have asked what we believe to be important questions about the problems that we see in this bill and we have received no answers.

Once again, I stress that we support the need for restraint, but we are convinced that the process set out in this bill cannot work. But even more so, we are genuinely concerned that the effect of this legislation is going to be to defer significant costs to future governments and future employers.

One example of this is the special-leave provisions for workers performing critical functions. The unpaid days off given under this special-leave category are to be taken from existing holidays and by law must be repaid after 1996. Now, the government has not said who is to be designated as providing critical functions. Based on the definitions of essential services under the Labour Relations Act, special leaves could apply to correction officers, nurses and other health workers, child care workers, ambulance drivers, utility workers, police and firefighters, and as well teachers could be considered critical services under Bill 48 because you can't just shut down the classroom for a day a week.

When you look at the kinds of positions which could be affected by this category, it's possible that at least half of the 900,000 members of the broader public sector could be included under the designation. This means that under Bill 48, as much as \$3 billion in costs could be deferred to future years.

I ask the Premier, how can you justify pushing costs that you have not even begun to calculate on to future governments and future employers?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I can only say to the honourable member that this is an exact repeat of an exchange that we had some time ago; it's an exact repeat of the question. I would simply say to her that we don't share her interpretation of the effect and the impact of the act.

**Mrs McLeod:** The reason that my questions, as we approach a vote on this important piece of legislation, will in fact repeat exchanges, as the Premier notes, that we have had in the past, is because these continue to be absolutely essential questions for public responsibility. We are frustrated that we cannot get answers from this government on them.

Another example of potential deferred costs as a result of your legislation was raised yesterday by our Finance critic, who raised concerns about the growing



liabilities in the government's pension plans. You have already deferred last year's \$500-million payment to the teachers' pension fund. You now say that you've found \$500 million more in reduced payments due to lower wages under the social contract. But the annual report of the teachers' pension plan shows the growth in the unfunded liability more than doubling over the next 15 years.

Again, I ask the Premier: What assurances can you provide that the pressures you are adding to pension plans will not mean more pension costs in the future? How big is the deferred pension bill going to be for future governments?

**Hon Mr Rae:** All we've said on the subject of pensions, and I think again we've been as clear as we can be, is that the assumptions behind the extraordinary payments, the additional payments which were set out in the schedule attached to the earlier legislation brought in by our predecessor, were based on certain assumptions about inflation and certain assumptions about the size of payouts and certain assumptions about the size of payouts and certain assumptions about the size of increases.

All we're saying is that it may well be, on the basis of the actuarial advice we've had, that those assumptions need to be looked at again. We would not do anything without agreement with our social contract partners and we would not do something, obviously, without full support from the actuarial profession with respect to what's being done. There may well be savings there, and if there are savings that are there, it would seem to me that it's perfectly responsible for us, indeed it's fiscally prudent for us, to make sure that we can achieve those savings without, for an instant, wanting to cast any doubts on the soundness of the plans and without in any way affecting the people's rights under the plan.

1410

**Mrs McLeod:** I would suggest to the Premier that when he uses words like "may well be," "seems to be," "I believe that," that is not the substance of tough budget accounting. Premier, I say to you that it is not being fiscally responsible to refuse to look at the future cost that your legislation is imposing on future governments just because the bills don't have to be paid today.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Set an example, Lyn. You show us. What's your alternative?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Durham Centre,

**Mrs McLeod:** You keep saying that you are willing to take everything into account. You have said that the negotiations will take into account wage freezes that are already in place. You've said that your negotiations will take into account unpaid leaves that are already in effect. You've said that the negotiations will take into

account delaying any wage reductions until existing collective agreements expire.

But you have not at any point explained how these measures are going to be taken into account, when they will be taken into account or where you intend to find the money to take them into account, and I am asking, how many of these costs are you simply going to defer to the future? Why will you not look honestly at the future cost of your legislation, at what you can realistically achieve under your social contract negotiations in the last six months of the year, and then take some practical steps to look at cuts in your own operations to meet your budget targets?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say directly to the honourable member that of course we're looking at all those things in terms of the expenditure control plan, which was also opposed by the Liberal Party. We're doing it in terms of all the efforts that we make. Whatever we've done, I know it will be opposed by the Leader of the Opposition, but let me just say to the Leader of the Opposition, that coming from a party which left this government to pay for the SkyDome, which left this government to pay for Darlington, which left this government with a structural deficit of some \$8 billion, you are in no position to lecture anybody with regard to future costs.

You're the experts on future costs. The Liberal Party wrote the book on future costs and establishing a burden for future generations. We're the party and we're the generation that's now paying the bills that you left us in your time in office. That's what we're doing.

**Mrs McLeod:** Premier, \$3 billion which you will not even acknowledge is a potential deferred cost because you refuse to look at the cost of your own legislation.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The Leader of the Opposition with her second question.

ONTARIO TRAINING AND ADJUSTMENT BOARD

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is also for the Premier. This government has talked about its intention to implement the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board literally since it took office. The government set up a transition team working out of offices at 101 Bloor Street West, and yet the OTAB legislation has not yet been passed. The legislation, in fact, was not introduced until a year after the program was announced, it is still waiting for the government to call third reading and it is a long way from actually being implemented.

Yet we have found that Management Board staff have confirmed that the government has leased over 5,000 square feet of empty office space for OTAB, down the street at 175 Bloor Street East, at a cost of \$154,000 a year. The lease runs for 10 years and the \$27-per-square-foot cost is considerably higher than the \$20-per-

square-foot average cost in Toronto today. I ask the Premier, why are you leasing expensive and unused office space for a program that does not yet exist?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I will be referring this question to the Minister of Education and Training.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I very much appreciate the question from the Leader of the Opposition. I find it very interesting, in her question she refers to the fact that we haven't received third reading of the OTAB bill yet. I would be more than willing to have third reading on OTAB.

We spent time in committee; we spent time and time in committee; we thought we had agreements of when bills were going to be completed; we thought the bill was going to be reported to the House for third reading, and instead the opposition parties referred it to committee of the whole House.

We in the government are proceeding with the implementation of OTAB. We feel that the coordination of training programs and having a training strategy in this province that will be directed by the labour market partners in this province will in fact be good for the economy and will make better use of limited funds in this province, for the first time, on a training strategy.

We don't need a lecture from the Leader of the Opposition party about the time to implement OTAB in this province. If it's taking too long, then perhaps we could get some cooperation from the opposition party and get the legislation moving ahead.

**Mrs McLeod:** I can understand why the Premier referred the question. It's quite apparent that he had not been made aware that he was now an absentee tenant.

The minister's refusal to answer the question which was asked, however, is not acceptable and I say to the minister, the question you addressed about how soon third reading of OTAB would take place is not related to the question I asked about the government's renting of unused office space.

Just to put it in context, it was in fact two years ago that you announced the OTAB legislation initiative, but the legislation still has not been passed. The fact is that, because you have not brought that legislation forward, whatever your intents, there are no programs in place and the other fact is, quite simply, that you have been paying rent on this unused office space since last October and the office is fully furnished.

The OTAB transition team told us, when we asked the OTAB transition team, that absolutely no arrangement had been made for office space for OTAB. But Management Board staff confirm that this unused office space is indeed being rented for OTAB.

We went to the office, we found the lights were out, the doors were locked, there was no one there, the people next door haven't seen anybody there. I have to ask you, how do you justify wasting \$154,000 a year

leasing unused office space when you keep talking to everybody else about making tough choices on cuts?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** If the Leader of the Opposition is blaming or concerned about the fact that I was talking about the timing of the legislation, she's the one who raised it in her question, so I was responding to her question.

We are in the process, even in the absence of the legislation being passed, of setting up the infrastructure. There are people working on the transition. We will be consolidating the programs. There are training programs being delivered in this province, but those training programs will be transferred to the OTAB project.

I will have to get a specific answer for her about the space she's referring to. I will get that answer for her, but I think the Leader of the Opposition should be aware that there are training programs, and she knows it, that are to be delivered by the province. When OTAB is up and running, those programs will come directly under the control of OTAB, so it's unfair to say there's nothing happening just because the opposition parties have held up third reading of OTAB.

**Mrs McLeod:** I can appreciate the minister's difficulty. It's awkward when the Premier refers a question to you as the manager of the program, instead of to the Chairman of Management Board who was probably responsible for renting the unused space for the program the minister has not yet put in place. So there is an awkwardness. I should tell the minister, though, that we're well aware there is a transitional team, even before you have your laws passed, but that transition team has an office. It's at 101 Bloor Street and that's why we're wondering about the unused space at 175 Bloor Street.

I understand that \$154,000 may not seem like a great deal of money to a government that spends almost that much on a single ad. Nevertheless, we believe that examples like this of wasteful spending are exactly what makes the public believe that this government is not making a serious effort to look at its own operations. It is exactly for this reason that people who are being hit with \$2 billion in new taxes are so upset with the government.

1420

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation and Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs):** I've got your expenses right here, Lyn: \$320,000.

**Mrs McLeod:** I realize that the member opposite is interjecting and we should not acknowledge that, but since he's specifically referencing our caucus's ability to control our expenditures, I say with pride that today's expenditure statements show that this caucus has reduced its own operations by \$100,000, because we are serious about reducing expenditures.

People who are being asked to make cuts, to make



personal sacrifices, are questioning whether or not this government is doing everything possible to cut its own spending.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** We all know you bury yours in your office. Don't be so phoney over there. Every one of your cabinet ministers buries it in the office. Get up and tell the truth.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for St Catharines. Could the Leader of the Opposition place her question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes, I will. The question relates to the fact that this government has spent \$154,000 a year on leased space since last October which has not been used. The decision to lease this office space could not have been made by accident, without senior staff in somebody's ministry being aware. I ask the minister, how does this happen? Why did no one question signing a lease for office space that this government has not used?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I'm certainly very pleased to hear that the Leader of the Opposition is cutting back on the expenses for her caucus. Maybe she can stop sending direct mail into my riding from the Liberal caucus, in a riding she doesn't even represent. It's true and you know it.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Cooke:** It's true. Plus the other two Windsor ridings.

I told the Leader of the Opposition that nobody on this side of the House approves the wasting of any money, whether it's \$154,000 or whether it's \$154 million. We don't approve of that. I don't have all the facts in front of me. I will find out exactly what happened and get an explanation for the member. I'll try to do it before the end of question period.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. This afternoon we will vote on second reading of your social contract legislation. We see this vote as being one that is pretty straightforward: Do we support the principle of cutting back the size and cost of government or do we support the union leaders who do not want to cut back the size and cost of government?

Premier, we want you to know that, unlike the Liberals, who still play the old-time, vested interest, oppose-for-opposition's-sake politics, we plan to support the principle of downsizing the cost of government. We support that goal and have clearly indicated that to you all along.

Having said that, we all know this legislation was drafted pretty hurriedly, we all know it's not perfect, and you know we have difficulties with some parts of the legislation. We intend, as you know, to force this bill into committee, where we will move amendments that will ensure fair, permanent and structural down-

sizing of government.

Premier, since your government holds a majority on all committees, I would ask you this: When we force this bill today out to committee, will you personally ensure adequate committee time for our caucus, which wishes to make this bill better, to bring forward and debate our amendments? Will you make sure that we have time to do that?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Despite any temptations to the contrary from the members of the Liberal Party, I would simply say to the leader of the third party that, first of all, I'd say to him in all seriousness, if there are amendments that are going to be forthcoming from the Conservative Party, or I would say from the Liberal Party, since I gather the Liberal Party has expressed concerns about the bill, and if there are serious suggestions with respect to amendments, I would ask that they be shared with us as soon as possible so that, if there are any technical issues that need to be dealt with by the official draftspeople and so on in committee of the whole, those are issues that can be dealt with. But I would hope that we could deal with this matter in committee of the whole in terms of a good discussion here in the House and have an opportunity for a good discussion.

I would say to him very directly, we are very interested in hearing what particular amendments are going to be forthcoming from whatever side of the House or from others, and we look forward to that.

**Mr Harris:** We too, Premier, I want you to know, are interested in facilitating moving this legislation along. We think, as we've always said, meaningful negotiations will not take place until the union leaders clearly understand what the alternative is. You can call it bang, bang, bang or first, second, third reading; we're still very interested and believe that's the only way it will proceed.

Yesterday in the House you offered support in principle for the establishment of an expenditure review committee. I agree, you said you'd like to see the wording, and we could talk about that. We would like the committee to deal with eliminating things like the year-end burnoff and review the necessity of government programs. It could well make recommendations on, could some services be better delivered by the private sector than the public sector? Premier we'll also be moving amendments which will provide for whistle-blowing protection of employees as part of that as well.

Now, in conjunction with this committee recommendation, another amendment that we've talked about was to encourage the efficiency and the elimination of waste by setting up a system of rewarding public servants who develop ideas to save money, instead of the current system that tends to reward particularly middle management with having more employees or bigger budgets for

spending more money.

Will you, support the principle of this amendment, which will simply ask for a different way of rewarding a number of our civil servants by way of pay for encouraging efficiency instead of them now being rewarded for wasting money?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member, just so you know, that in the context of the talks that have been held since April, we have encouraged the whistle-blowing idea as something to be incorporated into sectoral agreements. We believe in it strongly. We've been working on the legislation with respect to the public service, and we're strong supporters of it.

Second of all, with respect to the issue of performance bonuses, productivity increases and sharing the benefits from these gains are key elements of long-term restructuring and reducing waste and inefficiency in government, and again it's something that at the sectoral tables we've been encouraging.

I'll have to see the specific wording of the amendments, but the principles are ones that we are very much encouraging to be put in place.

**Mr Harris:** I believe I also indicated that I think there are a number in both management and unions in the private sector, CAW in particular, who have experience in negotiating productivity bonuses for employees. In the case of CAW, they gain when they manufacture the same number of cars with half the number of employees, and we should do that.

In committee as well we will be moving an amendment that calls for a hiring freeze. This amendment will acknowledge the need for essential services to be maintained by allowing for flexibility to hire classroom teachers or firefighters, police and others for essential services.

To date, my sense has been that you have dismissed my caucus's proposals for getting the attrition clock counting in this method. In doing so, I suggest that you are precluding some of the sound long-term management we need to permanently downsize the cost in government, particularly after eight years of high spending and overhiring governments, and I acknowledge your comments earlier today, most of the hiring done by the Liberals.

Will you support our amendment for a hiring freeze while allowing for flexibility as one of the tools to ensure permanent structural downsizing of the government, not short-term fixes?

1430

**Hon Mr Rae:** I haven't dismissed the ideas with respect to the kind of approach that has been taken at all. We in fact have argued that we need to go beyond a simple freeze in terms of its impacts. Again, it will depend on the wording, because the concern that has been expressed to us from a number of ministries, from

managers, who I am sure you would want us to listen to, within ministries, has been what do we do if the factor-80 window which we've opened has a tremendous impact, let's say, on the Ministry of Correctional Services, if I can just give you one example? If that ends up having a serious impact on our ability to provide critical and essential services in that area, a blanket freeze is not the answer. In fact a blanket freeze would be unacceptable.

What I hear you saying is you want to see something which is flexible. The issue then becomes, if it's that flexible, is it a freeze or not. We've been reluctant to go out and say, "Yes, we're going to freeze," knowing that as soon as we bring in the exceptions that'll be the headline the next day, saying, "You said you'd freeze and now you're not."

I would say to the honourable member, we're interested in downsizing and we're interested in reducing in a number of ministries. In a number of areas that's exactly what we're doing. The critical point, though, is to make sure that we've got the flexibility to ensure that we have appropriate staffing levels at institutions where public health and safety and other issues are involved. We're trying to find that happy medium, and I look forward to seeing any wording that you've got.

#### YORK DETENTION CENTRE

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question is to the Premier. I'm going to be sending you over a copy of a letter which was sent to you on September 1, 1992, and also a copy of your response. The letter testifies to a serious breach between the policy and practice within your government on the issue of sexual assault and harassment, a breach that has been covered up by senior staff, including ministers in your cabinet, over a period of three and a half years.

I have other letters: one dated June 5, 1991, to Zanana Akande; another to Marion Boyd, dated April 6, 1992; and two letters to your current Minister of Community and Social Services, dated in March and May of this year.

The letters all report the actions of a male employee at the York Detention Centre, a sexual predator, who targeted young, mostly unclassified, female workers, many of whom were community college students. The letter also reports the inaction of your government in protecting the innocent victims involved. It is believed as many as 14 employees were victimized.

Can you explain why you and senior ministers of your government took so long to respond to the serious allegations of sexual assault and harassment at this provincial institution?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I refer the question to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I think there are a couple of points



that I would like to say in response to the member's question. The first is specifically to the letter that he refers to that was sent to the Premier. My understanding is that letter was referred at the time to, I believe, the Attorney General's office for them to pursue, so I think that as far as the Office of the Premier was concerned, they pursued the matter in the normal course.

The other point I think I would like to make is that the employee that I believe the member is referring to had in fact left the employ of the ministry certainly prior to that letter being sent, indeed even prior to this government taking office. I think that is important in the sequence of events.

Third, in the whole discussion that there has been around this issue it's my understanding that in fact there has been a great deal of discussion with employees at the particular centre, all of whom have made it consistently clear from our officials not only that we have zero tolerance level with respect to sexual harassment, but that in fact people were encouraged to go to the police if they had specific allegations they wanted to make.

**Mr Jackson:** It's of absolutely no comfort to now two rape victims and four sexual assault victims that the minister has stood in his place and said they're to take some comfort that this person is no longer an employee at this institution.

The issues before the House today and before the Premier and his government have to do with the fact that your government has a workplace harassment and discrimination prevention policy. Those guidelines were brought in March 1992. According to them, every ministry is responsible for their implementation—not the Attorney General's office but the Ministry of Community and Social Services, and you're the minister.

I want to send you over two copies of letters that were sent directly to you. These letters set out very clearly the allegations of sexual abuse and harassment. They talk directly about senior officials at the assistant deputy minister level who frustrated the investigations, who coerced and dissuaded the victims from their natural rights in this province in accordance with your own ministry guidelines. It was only last night—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** —that one of the victims went forward to the police with charges after months and in fact three years of frustration.

Was a thorough investigation ever undertaken in accordance with your own government's policies as set out by your Premier? If that was undertaken, have you read it and when did you read it?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I want to say that the member raises obviously some very important issues. I want to tell him very categorically that from the time I became aware of this issue, I asked for some further information and in

fact asked that an operations review take place, which operations review has been under way and I'm expecting the results of that review by early July. I will be looking very carefully at the recommendations and the conclusions that come out of that review.

**Mr Jackson:** I sent over letters dated March 9. More important, the Premier is aware that letters were sent to the former minister, Ms Akande, in 1991 about these cases. You're going to tell these victims that in July—Minister, you won't have until July, because the police are visiting your offices today to ask for and to receive a copy of this report. They are interested in how the rights of the victims of this sexual assault may have been abused in the process by your own ministry.

This is a very serious matter involving as many as 10 or 12 victims at York Detention Centre. Given that the letters shared with three ministers of Community and Social Services, involvement at the deputy ministerial and assistant deputy minister levels, why is it that victims were frustrated, actively discouraged and indeed harassed when seeking their natural rights to justice in this province to pursue a sexual assault charge? Why has it taken three and a half years for your ministry to wake up and for you to stand in this House and say maybe by July you'll have a report? You tell that to the victims who are watching you today.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I think it's all right, I suppose, for the member opposite to pontificate about what could be happening or couldn't be happening. What I think—

**Mr Jackson:** I wasn't sitting on letters for four months like you were.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** What I think the member should also take into account is the answer I've given him, which is, first of all that, during the course of all these events, it was made consistently clear, as I understand it, by officials in the ministry to employees at the centre as to their rights—and their encouragement in fact of them to go to the police if they had allegations of sexual abuse and harassment. That has been done, as I understand it, consistently.

I can also say to the member that it wasn't in July or in June that I asked for this operations review to happen. In fact this happened back at the time that I became aware of the first letter, which is dated in early March. Even prior to that, I know that coming from the administrator of the centre there had been a request for an operations review back to January of this year.

Obviously, if the member says the police are looking for additional information, whatever information we have we will share with them. Now that charges have also been laid, obviously the process will ensue and whatever the justice system determines will develop on its own course.

But I can just say to the member that I too take these issues very seriously, which is why, as I've indicated to

him, in addition to all of the previous work that had happened, when I became aware of this issue I asked for a further operational review to be undertaken so that in fact we could understand if there were some additional problems that needed to be looked after.

1440

## WAGE PROTECTION

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Labour. You'll recall that in 1967, under the former Liberal government, there was a unit set up—

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** In 1987.

**Mr Mahoney:** What did I say?

**Ms Poole:** You said 1967.

**Mr Mahoney:** Excuse me, 1987. I'm a little behind my time.

There was a unit set up for the purposes of collecting money from employers who had been paying less than minimum wage to their employees, who had reneged on paying vacation pay or any other benefits they were entitled to. I recall, as a matter of fact, how in 1987 you and your party in opposition were quite congratulatory towards our government for setting up this unit.

In the first year of its operation, it collected only \$64,500. You have recently announced that you will be disbanding this unit in spite of the fact that it has raised more money than it cost to operate and had its best three months' collection period just before you decided to close it. In three months ending March 31 it collected over \$901,000. This is actually an agency that makes money for the government and that helps serve those workers who are least able to help themselves.

Minister, can you tell us why you've done this?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** The reason we've done it is relatively obvious. The reason we've done it is simply because we are in tough economic times and we are looking at where we can do something—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** So are the people who are going to benefit.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for York Centre.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** —that we're currently doing better than we have done it in the past. We have come up with—

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** —for this particular operation.

**Mr Sorbara:** What about the people who were going to benefit? How tough is this for them? Four bucks an hour.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for York Centre. Had the minister completed his response? The member for Mississauga West with his supplementary.

**Mr Mahoney:** I think I heard him say it was because we're in tough economic times. This is a little bit like the decision the Premier made to reduce the size of cabinet by adding more ministers. There's a little confusion that I don't quite understand.

What you've done here is you've eliminated an agency that actually makes money. On top of that, out of the seven full-time permanent positions you've moved six of them into the Ministry of Finance. You've transferred the cost from this successful agency collecting money on behalf of those folks least able to help themselves. This is a clear example of how this government thinks it can fight its deficit on the backs of those people least able to help themselves, how this government has completely lost its purpose, lost its direction and lost any caring it has for the workers of this province.

Minister, you're saying: "We can handle the job maybe even better there, in the Ministry of Finance. If we're wrong then we'll have to do some fast readjusting." That's terrific. What do you say about your fast readjusting to the workers who are not getting the money below minimum wage, who are getting shafted by companies and not collecting the money that's truly due to them? What kind of an answer does the current Minister of Labour have to those people?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** For one thing, I didn't say that we could do it better within the Ministry of Finance. The job is still going to be done within the Ministry of Labour. It might be difficult for the critic to understand, but the fact is that with the wage protection program and some of the other changes we've made, we have better than 50 additional people working on key areas of concern in the Ministry of Labour. We have sent the collection operation out to the field, where we feel we can do it better.

I might also say that the three people who were in charge of the operation when we had a separate collection division are still with us, are still organizing it and collected more than half of the amount of money that the member is talking about. We think we can do it with the employment standards officers in the field and in the regional offices much more effectively than we were doing it with the current group in the ministry itself.

## INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. I read your rhetoric following yesterday's steel decision and it seemed to me to be quite tough. I think you said Canada should "clobber Washington with a two-by-four" because of the anti-dumping duty slapped on Ontario steel. Quite frankly, while there is a dispute mechanism available, I tend to agree with you; I think we should get tough with all those that throw barriers and tariffs in our road.

But time and time again my caucus has asked you to



take that same tough stance against the province of Quebec. Yesterday, the member for Leeds-Grenville raised yet another example of how unfair Quebec protectionism hurts Ontario businesses and hurts Ontario employers and costs Ontario consumers.

Can you explain to me why you want to, with the United States, hit them over the head with a two-by-four, while for Quebec you continue to follow a 20-year-old tried and failed policy of throwing marshmallows at Quebec?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, I will refer this to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I want to point out, first of all, and reiterate the comments that I've made in this House and the Premier has made in this House with respect to the interprovincial trade barriers that the province of Quebec currently has in place. Those are provincial government barriers that have been put in place that we object to. We've made that very clear. I've made that clear in a meeting with the minister from Quebec. I've made it clear at interprovincial trade ministers' meetings. We are pursuing bilateral discussions with them. We are engaged in meetings to negotiate bringing down those interprovincial trade barriers. It would seem to me that while negotiations are taking place, it would be counterproductive to erect new barriers at this point in time.

The Premier has been down in Washington trying to engage the US steel industry in negotiations about a US steel accord. They have said no. They have said they will not negotiate. They have said they're not interested. They have said that they are going to use their trade rules and their trade harassment activities to disadvantage our Canadian steel industry. There is no room for negotiations with people who won't sit down and negotiate.

With Quebec, in fact, we are negotiating. We do think there is a serious problem. We will continue to pursue it and we expect that we will have action.

**Mr Harris:** Minister, we've continued to tell you and the Premier and your cabinet and your party and your government that if you downsize the public sector, which we support, you have to at the same time allow our private sector to upsize and to compete. You're going to have to abandon a number of positions you've taken, your anti-business policies such as Bill 40. You're going to have to bring down the cost of doing business in Ontario so our companies can compete. And you're going to have to fight a lot harder than we have for the last 125 years of talking to break down the interprovincial trade barriers, particularly those with Quebec.

I know you've been preoccupied with the social

contract and preoccupied with downsizing the public sector, but I'm going to tell you that you're missing the boat on one of the opportunities to upsize Ontario.

Premier Frank McKenna is making great headway. He now has Quebec at the table. They are now talking to them about the interprovincial trade barriers between New Brunswick and Quebec. You want to hit the US over the head with a two-by-four. I don't disagree with that, but I'm going to tell you this: Until you get serious, you're going to continue to have Quebec say: "Why should we negotiate? We can take the marshmallows in the head, and we got all the jobs."

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the leader place a question, please.

**Mr Harris:** Will you toughen up your stance with Quebec, as New Brunswick has, as other provinces have, and get these interprovincial trade barriers out of our road?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The leader of the third party seems to ignore the fact that with respect to the US steel industry, they're not interested in negotiations; they're interested in trade harassment. That's what we've been experiencing. There is a need for a strong response from the steel industry and the federal government, and we continue to be supportive of that and part of that and participating in that.

1450

With respect to interprovincial trade barriers, we are engaged in negotiations, both multilateral across the provinces and bilaterally with the province of Quebec. We are negotiating with them. We have issues on the table. They have concerns with respect to the Ontario economy. We believe that this is a very serious and important issue. You do not hit people over the head when you're at the table talking to them; what you do is make progress in negotiations. We believe that we are.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** My question is to the Minister of Environment and Energy. Once again, the Metro media is supporting the notion that garbage of Metropolitan Toronto should be dumped on the less fortunate communities that have a council that is willing to sell its community out for a dollar figure. The dollar figure, it would appear to me, is the reason for all the garbage decisions that Metro Toronto has made. The money, not the environment, is what motivates them.

My community finds it repugnant to imagine, as this morning's paper says in the editorial "Keep Options Open," that Metro can't afford to be without a place to send its garbage. The reality is that this government has put in place a process that will find a landfill site for the garbage and there is no need for Metro to continue to throw good money after bad.

Will the minister confirm for me today that the

process that has been undertaken by the IWA to find three landfill sites in the GTA to serve these communities will continue and that in fact will be the way in which Metro will be able to dispose of its garbage?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Yes, I can confirm that the IWA process will continue, and I would point out that it's interesting that the Metro committee has proposed the use of the IWA's criteria and process for its site search. So I think that shows that the IWA process is accepted as the best way to go.

**Mr Wiseman:** The willing host scenario that Metro keeps talking about has my constituents outraged. They know well what Metro considers a willing host. They suffered through this type of process through the Liberal government; it was called *The Rest of Durham Decides They Can Make a Lot of Money If They Let Metro Dump Garbage in Pickering*, in an area 20 miles away.

My community believes that political accountability can only occur if this site is located within the municipality it serves. In fact, I delivered a petition to this House on Monday with over 10,000 signatures on it which stated on the bottom of it, "Political accountability can only occur if the site is located within the municipality it serves."

Is Metro so dependent on the revenues from garbage that they're willing to subvert the IWA process for their own financial gain?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I won't comment on Metro's concern about finances. I would just say that there is nothing to prevent any proponent from pursuing an environmental assessment to establish a landfill site in the province. I would say, though, that it is significant, the question of the definition of a "willing host." It is difficult, perhaps, for all to agree on what that actually constitutes. Does it constitute simply a commitment on the part of the municipal leaders of a community or does it require some wider support within the community? That's difficult to define, and these are issues that obviously would have to be taken into account, along with provincial government policy, by the Environmental Assessment Board when and if it is presented with a proposal by a proponent.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a question for the Premier on the social contract legislation. I know that you must be aware of the legislation and especially that part of the legislation which deals with what a public sector consists of. The legislation states, and I tell you that I am paraphrasing, that the public sector consists of, in the case of a municipality, any corporation—and I underline that—which operates or provides for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage and other refuse for a municipality.

My municipality, the city of Mississauga, like many

others, has a contract with a private company, a private waste management company, to collect and dispose of residential waste. Privately, they have contracted terms and conditions that deal with the collection and disposal of waste.

Is it the intent of your legislation—and this is my question; you must clarify this issue—that contracts entered into between the municipality and the private sector are now going to be caught up in the net of social contract, that in fact they are part of the legislation and in fact the municipalities must comply with the legislation as it affects private contracts with the private sector?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** That's an excellent and very pointed question to which I am hesitant to give a definitive answer, but I would say to the member before he blows up, just discussing it informally with ministers here, that's not our view of the intent of the act. If there are any clarifications necessary to make that clear, that's precisely the kind of thing we would deal with in terms of amendment.

**Mr Offer:** I want to read part of the legislation. The schedule states, "The public sector in Ontario consists of," and the appendix under Ministry of Municipal Affairs states, and again I paraphrase, any corporation "which operates or provides the collection, removal and disposal of garbage and other refuse for a municipality." Your legislation takes them into the net.

My question by way of supplementary, as it is surprising that the Premier is not aware of the legislation, is: Will you commit to the municipalities? You have put them in an incredibly impossible position. When you pass this legislation, you will automatically make every municipality breach another law dealing with contract in terms of the private sector. Will you say today to all of those municipalities that you will indemnify them for the damages they will incur when they are sued by the private sector over contracts that they have entered into?

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Are you going to rule by fiat? Whatever you want today goes?

**Hon Mr Rae:** We will not be ruling by Fiat or any other kind of car.

I would say to the member for Mississauga North, we will deal with that kind of an issue in committee of the whole quite gladly. But I would say directly to him, I think he's exaggerating a little bit the level of uncertainty that's out there with respect to the legislation.

#### RACE RELATIONS

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I've sent a package over to the Premier, and I think it's now with the Attorney General, from a press conference that was held today with the member for Willowdale, Mr Charles Harnick, and myself. So the question will be going to the Attorney General at this point.



Today, Mr Harnick and I will both be introducing separate bills which we hope will effectively end the dissemination of hate literature and the acts of hatred against individuals.

During the past month there's been a tremendous increase in the number of incidents of racial intolerance within our society. Some eight have been reported, to our count, in the media. We're also seeing groups such as the Heritage Front and the Church of the Creator using rock concerts to deliver racist remarks. We're seeing the rise in the recruitment of young people into these groups. We feel the time for talk is over and the time for action is now.

These bills will begin to empower individuals to fight for their basic rights. My bill will bring the Ontario Human Rights Code into the 1990s by providing a legislative vehicle for individuals to protect their rights to be free from discrimination, either in public statements or written material or visual representations.

I'm asking you, Attorney General, and from you to the Premier and your caucus and cabinet, will you work with us on this non-partisan issue?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** There were representatives, obviously, of my office at the press conference. I have my own copy of the materials that were circulated.

As I said in this House a couple of weeks ago in answer to a question from the leader of the third party, there are a number of civil issues that we as a government are quite prepared to consider, including changes to the Human Rights Code, including the kind of civil action that's implied by Mr Harnick's bill. We are certainly prepared to look at these.

I think the member is well aware that in the civil action area, the burden of proof is considerably less than it is in the criminal area and that the balance-of-probabilities factor in the civil area may well make it more possible for us to control these actions which all of us find abhorrent.

I also think, however, having just glanced at these two bills, that we also will have to be very mindful of the possibility of charter challenge. We'll have to work together to see how this can be done to protect rights and to balance out the respective rights of individuals.

1500

Certainly this is the kind of action that we are discussing with the round table on anti-racism. It is exactly the kind of action we're prepared to work with the opposition on, as well as with the affected communities and the municipalities. We are planning to meet in the very near future with the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, which has requested a meeting to talk about the particular problems that are being experienced in this area.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the

minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** We are very pleased to know that we have the support of the third party in taking this action.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Attorney General, as you're aware, I'm going to be introducing a bill entitled An Act to Protect the Civil Rights of Persons in Ontario. This act will empower people to bring an action against someone who has promoted hatred against them. The purpose of the act is quite simply to fight racism and to fight against the promotion of hatred.

Knowing that you will not likely be here for private members' hour when this bill is debated, will you send a message to your caucus right now and tell us whether you will be supporting this piece of legislation or whether you won't be?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I have just indicated that I am going to be having the ministry look at this legislation to see the extent to which we believe it meets the needs that have been identified. If indeed it is clear that this is an appropriate vehicle, I not only will be here but will be encouraging my colleagues to follow it, and possibly, if all we need to look at are some amendments, to make sure that we get into a venue where we can consider those amendments.

#### ONTARIO TRAINING AND ADJUSTMENT BOARD

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that if I could get information, I would before the end of question period. I'd like to inform the members that a lease search was undertaken, with bids being requested from five landlords with space available in the vicinity of 625 Church Street, where the bulk of the staff who make up OTAB's head office are already located. The lease search received Management Board approval and was in accordance with Management Board policy.

I'd like to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that there is no rent being paid for the current facilities. Part of the rental agreement was 17 months rent-free. So I'm not quite sure what the Leader of the Opposition—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Supplementary.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I appreciate the additional information which the minister has provided. It leads to a number of other questions which I would reiterate in the supplementary. I suppose I could begin with why the information given by Management Board staff would differ somewhat from the information the minister has provided.

Nevertheless, if I took the fact that there is a lease-free period for the lease that has been signed, the question stands as to why there is an OTAB head office, to which the minister refers, which sounds somewhat substantial, already located before a piece of legislation

has in fact been passed; why there would be a long-term lease signed for a program even before the legislation was introduced in the House, let alone before the legislation was passed; and why, if in fact these figures are correct, any government would enter into a long-term lease at a figure of some \$27 per square foot when the average rental cost is \$20 per square foot?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I guess when you've been discovered to have the wrong facts, you have to try to figure out some defence. The fact of the matter is that since the business community and the labour community have both supported OTAB, while there's been general support for OTAB, it makes a heck of a lot of sense to get the infrastructure set up, and up and running. That's what we're doing.

Maybe what the Leader of the Opposition should simply have said is: "Thanks for the information. I was dead wrong in my question."

#### TRUCKING INDUSTRY

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. You and the Premier are constantly repeating that you're interested in job creation and making sure that the economy recovers in Ontario.

Minister, I told you on April 29 of a golden opportunity to keep jobs in Ontario and to strengthen an important sector of our industrial base in Ontario. I told you that one of these opportunities was the long-awaited legislation to permit longer trucks in this province the way other competitors like the United States and other provinces in Canada have been doing for quite some time.

You will know that in 1991 alone there were more than 190 bankruptcies and in 1992 there were 188 bankruptcies in the Ontario trucking industry. Why have you failed to introduce in this session the long-awaited legislation to permit the Ontario trucking industry to use longer trucks so it can compete internationally?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** Very soon a decision will be finalized.

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** Well, the member will be aware that there is such a thing as process. We're concerned about the competitiveness. We're aware that \$100 million of competitiveness per year is at stake. We're very much aware that truck configuration invites criticism, positive and negative, from everyone around. Many groups had to be consulted and are still being consulted.

We're also aware of our duty, of our mandate, to look at the impact on the environment, economically; what happens in terms of emissions, total weight, repartition on axle weight are all factors that have to be meticulously looked at before a decision is made.

However, the point is well taken and in the final

analysis a decision is pending.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Is it within your mandate to tell us what the Minister of Transportation actually says during his answers?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Bruce surely does not want the Speaker challenging anyone's questions or answers.

#### PETITIONS

##### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Mr Speaker, as you know, the folks in Ontario have been aware for some time about the concern of the people for Bruce A, and there's a petition which includes over 15,000 names in support of the continued existence of the Bruce A facility. I present one of those petitions now to the House. I have attached my signature, and we have more of those.

##### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan and the social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across the province,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

#### JUSTICE SYSTEM

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition here.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas Brian Kavanagh will be eligible for parole on July 22, 1993, after serving only 20 months (1/6) of his sentence, that this travesty of justice be addressed immediately by whatever means available and that are within your power to prevent the premature release of this person from custody.

"On January 31, 1991, Ellen Sands Kavanagh was stabbed 32 times in her back, hands, ear, eye, cheek, neck, chest and stomach with a fishing knife, her head was bludgeoned twice with a fifteen-pound axe, fracturing her skull in three places and breaking her jaw. Her neck was slashed twice with a saw. Her estranged



husband, Brian Kavanagh, was convicted of manslaughter in November of 1991 and received a sentence of 10 years in a federal prison.

"On July 22, 1993, Brian Kavanagh comes before the National Parole Board. On that date he is eligible for unescorted temporary absence and day parole. He has already applied to a halfway house in the city of his choice and will only have to report between midnight and 6 am to that location. The victim's family lives in terror at the thought of his release. We, the undersigned, wish to loudly proclaim that:

"This is not our concept of Canadian justice."

It's been signed by thousands of people, as you can see, and I affix my signature too.

1510

#### CONTRAT SOCIAL

**M. Jean Poirier (Prescott et Russell):** Comme hier et la semaine passée, j'ai deux autres pétitions signées par des gens de Prescott et Russell et adressées à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario. Ils sont en désaccord avec la façon de procéder de M. Rae face à la coalition, et ces soussignés-là demandent à M. Rae de corriger tous les déficits, les problèmes avec son contrat social, bien sûr. Je suis certain qu'il va accéder à la requête de ces braves gens et je vous dis, Monsieur le Président, que j'ai apposé mon nom sur ces pétitions et que je les appuie à 100 %.

#### HISTORIC VEHICLES

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas government funding is supplied for the restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and sites, both public and privately owned, the financing of museums and the preservation of Ontario heritage;

"Whereas historic vehicle owners receive no assistance in the restoration or maintenance of these fine examples of an integral part of the history and heritage of Ontario,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"We, the members of Ontario antique auto clubs and concerned citizens, respectfully request an amendment to the Highway Traffic Act and regulations permitting a one-time-only licence fee, valid as long as the registered owner retains ownership, for 35-years-and-older historic vehicles, with an option to register and legally display year-of-manufacture plates in place of current issue historic vehicle plates. Modified vehicles, kit cars or streetrods are not eligible."

I've affixed my signature.

#### ACCESSORY APARTMENTS

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition here from the inclusive neighbourhood campaign, which is located in Toronto, from a Barbara

Jamison. To this date, these 111 signatures that are presented on this petitions bring it to a total of 2,428 petitions that have been forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is speaking in support of the passage, and quick passage, of Bill 90, and it is petitioning the government of Ontario, and in particular the Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Housing, and the Minister of Citizenship, responsible for human rights issues, to immediately put an end to the widespread violation of human rights across the province by amending the Planning Act so that it will require municipalities to permit the creation of additional rental units that meet the health and safety standards in the neighbourhoods zoned for single-family housing.

There are 111 signatures on this petition, and I do affix my signature to it.

#### SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** I have a petition signed by 700 parents and interested parties in sheltered workshops from the city of Kingston, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Ministry of Community and Social Services has stated its intention and policy to reduce and ultimately discontinue funding in traditional segregated programs, resulting in the eventual phase-out of sheltered workshops; and

"Whereas the ministry itself recognizes that the needs of people who want meaningful work activity but are not able to work in a competitive environment may not be addressed," and those are quotes, Mr Speaker; "and

"Whereas this policy was formulated without grassroots consultation, especially without consulting individual parents and guardians of adults with disabilities; and

"Whereas no provision has been stipulated for individual assessments regarding the needs and desired outcomes for individual clients,

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Premier and the Minister of Community and Social Services to reinstate funding for sheltered workshops in the province of Ontario."

I have affixed my signature.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of immediate tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario

drivers,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** Again I bring to this assembly thousands of signatures that are against casinos and I'd like to read it. It says:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in an individual is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos in that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

We hope that they listen to these good people. I affix my signature to the petition.

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I have a petition. It's actually the same one as Mr Drainville's, to the Legislative Assembly.

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

I affix my signature to the petition.

#### DRUG BENEFITS

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I have a petition which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the 60+ Club of the city of Thunder Bay, Ontario, do hereby petition the government of Ontario to seriously reconsider its decision to reform the Ontario drug benefit program, which would reduce the health care services by \$4 billion."

I have affixed my name to this petition.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** This petition

is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas on October 24, 1991, the NDP government introduced Bill 143, the Waste Management Act, and tried to force the Legislature to pass the bill before Christmas 1991 without public consultation or notification to affected municipalities and residents and without naming the candidate landfill sites; and

"Whereas the NDP were forced into five weeks of public hearings and listened to over 200 presenters, all recommending amendments to Bill 143; and

"Whereas the NDP refused to listen or pass any opposition amendments to Bill 143 which would protect and secure individual and municipal rights to full environmental assessment hearings on waste alternatives such as rail haul; and

"Whereas the NDP used their majority to pass Bill 143 on April 23, 1992, with the full support and endorsement from Jim Wiseman, MPP, Durham West, Larry O'Connor, MPP, Durham-York, Gordon Mills, MPP, Durham East; and

"Whereas the NDP named 57 candidate landfill sites on June 4, 1992; and

"Whereas Ruth Grier and the Premier refused to meet with groups opposing the dumps and refused to consider the alternatives, like rail haul, contrary to Mrs Grier's support of rail haul in January 1991; and

"Whereas Mrs Grier refused to meet with the residents and mayor of Kirkland Lake to review the Adams mine proposal and proceeded to ban rail haul without considering the impact on the northern economy; and

"Whereas the NDP government created the Interim Waste Authority to find a solution to GTA waste and operate independently from the Ministry of Environment but at the same time the IWA must adhere to the minister's ideology and their ban of waste alternatives, such as rail haul and incineration; and

"Whereas the IWA and the New Democratic Party government refused to conduct an environmental assessment on the alternatives and remained firm on subjecting communities in the regions of York, Durham and Peel to a process that ignores their fundamental rights to a review of alternatives and employs a system of criteria ranking that defies logic and leads to the selection of dump sites on environmentally sensitive areas, prime agricultural land and sites located near urban areas,

"We, the undersigned, want Bill 143 revoked and replaced with a bill that would allow a full environmental assessment on all waste management options."

Signed by two people on Morrison Crescent in Markham and with my name affixed to it.

1520

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mrs Ellen MacKinnon (Lambton):** "To the Legis-



lative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, support the initiative of the council of the township of Bosanquet to bring piped water"—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs MacKinnon:** Excuse me, Mr Speaker. There are people who don't belong here.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mrs MacKinnon:**—"to service residents adjacent to Highway 21, the communities of Port Franks, Ravenswood, Ipperwash and the surrounding areas, at a cost of approximately \$2,500 to \$5,000 per household, debentured and payable over a five-year period."

I will sign this same petition.

#### ACCESSORY APARTMENTS

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a petition here signed by many residents in my community, including Susan Wilson and Rod Wilson of Oleander Crescent, and it reads as follows:

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario Legislature has given first reading to Bill 90, a bill to permit accessory dwelling units as of right and to permit granny flats,

"We, the undersigned, object to Bill 90 for the following reasons:

"(1) That the province examine the implications that Bill 90 may have on the rights of property owners, landlords and tenants with respect to their expectations of zoning authority in the neighbourhoods in which they live;

"(2) That the province not entertain Bill 90, removing the right of local government to regulate development without adequate public notification and opportunity to review and comment on Bill 90;

"(3) That the local municipality be granted the authority to regulate and license or register accessory apartments;

"(4) That the province, in consultation with local and regional authorities, examine methods of compensating the municipality for increased costs of servicing new residential growth accessory apartments;

"(5) That right of entry for bylaw enforcement officers to inspect accessory apartments during reasonable hours be incorporated into Bill 90;

"(6) That the city of Brampton supports granny flats as a form of housing intensification, subject to the insurance that the units will be removed at the end of their intended use;

"(7) If the province permits the enactment of this legislation, let Bill 90 be referred to a standing committee for public input."

This is signed by my residents and I'm affixing my signature thereto as well.

#### GO BUS SERVICE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows to object to the recent cuts to the GO Transit bus service for Woodbridge, Kleinburg, Nobleton, Bolton, Palgrave and Highway 9:

"Whereas this will be a major inconvenience to non-drivers; and

"Whereas it will have a negative impact on the local economy; and

"Whereas the lack of transit services will increase traffic, thereby increasing air pollution levels, at a time when all levels of government are making efforts to reduce pollution and encourage public transportation systems; and

"Whereas the cuts leave no alternative means of commuting in and out of Toronto during peak hours, and

"Whereas the lack of GO buses will force passengers, at one of the worst economic times in Ontario history, to incur extra expense finding another form of transportation."

It's petitioned that the government of Ontario overturn GO Transit's decision and restore GO Transit service to Bolton and Palgrave, and I've identified my signature in this petition.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Haeck from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills, as amended:

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Gloucester

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the Township of Atikokan.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendments:

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Chua Di-Da (Amida-temple) of Toronto

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting Cambridge-Guelph Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Georgian-Simcoe Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting Picton-Trenton Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Stratford, Huron and Bruce Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting Waterloo-St Jacobs Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting Waubaushehne Railway

Company Limited

Bill Pr34, An Act to revive Rosalind Blauer Centre for Child Care.

Your committee recommends that Bill Pr82, An Act respecting the Humane Society of Ottawa-Carleton, be not reported.

Your committee further recommends that the fees and the actual cost of printing be remitted on the following bills:

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Chua Di-Da (Amida-temple) of Toronto

Bill Pr34, An Act to revive Rosalind Blauer Centre for Child Care.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Marchese, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr43, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LE CODE DES DROITS DE LA PERSONNE

On motion by Mr Cousens, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 55, An Act to amend the Human Rights Code / Loi modifiant le Code des droits de la personne.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** The purpose of this bill is to give a person the right to make a complaint to the Ontario Human Rights Commission about any public statement or any written material or visual representation that ridicules or demeans the person or that discriminates, incites discrimination or expresses hatred against the person because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, family status or handicap.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 SUR LA PROTECTION  
DES DROITS CIVILS

On motion by Mr Harnick, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 56, An Act to protect the Civil Rights of Persons in Ontario / Loi visant à protéger les droits civils des personnes en Ontario.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** This bill gives a person the right to bring an action against another person whose conduct or communication promotes hatred or promotes the superiority or inferiority of a person because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, family status or handicap. The bill also makes it an offence to engage in such conduct or to make such a communication.

#### CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Marchese, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr44, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The next item of business is a deferred vote on Bill 48. There is a five-minute bell.

Point of order?

#### LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S COMMENTS

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Yes. Actually, I think perhaps it may be a point of privilege.

I reluctantly rise today to bring to the attention of the House—and I know everybody here in the House actually knows—the speech made by the Queen's representative in the province concerning certain aspects of political activity in the province of Ontario. The privilege is one which comes from the point of tradition and the role that has been traditionally played by the Lieutenant Governor in the province with respect to political matters.

There is no question that I revere the member who serves currently as the Queen's agent here, the representative of Her Majesty in the province of Ontario. I respect his judgement. I respect in many ways the contribution that he has made to the province. But I raise for you, Mr Speaker, what I believe are at least concerns enough that I could not let them pass without bringing them to the record of the floor of the House.

1530

I regret that I have to do this, because of the esteem in which I hold the Lieutenant Governor, but I think for the comment to have been made prior to a vote—in fact the very day prior to a vote on a piece of legislation which is a major centrepiece of government policy, the social contract—that in fact the social contract would be endorsed, or at least that the Premier would have his social contract, meaning that the Parliament, the Queen's subjects' place of deliberation would pass it, is a break from tradition.

Further, an examination of the text of the material which was delivered in the forum indicates that the Lieutenant Governor had endorsed the Premier for re-election should he run, or at least had said that he would win, has left me really with no alternative, not to, in my sense, ask for any kind of censuring or otherwise, but merely to raise it as a point of parliamentary tradition so that it can be noted and so that it cannot be allowed to pass, so that it be seen that Her Majesty, through her representatives, or Her Majesty's representatives can in fact play their role in that way.

If, for instance, there was an observation that the bill had passed second reading, that would, in my view, have been nothing more than remarking upon a factual set of circumstances. But when we have the vote coming today and the speech coming prior to it, it



creates a problem for me.

I have been seen, I think, by many as a traditionalist in terms of the ability of this forum to make our own decisions unaffected by the remarks of other organizations, of other institutions in our democratic society. We're a parliamentary democracy, but we have Her Majesty as the head of state for our Legislature. I am merely rising, as it were, to make sure that this Parliament, this people's council, can hold its position of paramountcy in relation to the business and the conduct of the public affairs of this province.

I note it here on the record so that the people know that we are concerned, that we in our party believe it was an unfortunate speech, that we believe it was a break with tradition and that we in the Liberal Party assert the paramountcy of Her Majesty's council to deal with public affairs and public business in our forum without being affected by remarks from another institution in our democratic society.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Mr Speaker, I want to address you and the members of this House on the issue raised by my House leader, the member for Bruce, and I want to do so, sir, in the very strongest terms, because I believe very, very strongly that my privileges as an elected member of this Parliament have been breached in the most serious and significant way. I think that applies to every single member of this Legislature.

I would say to you as well that it most certainly applies in these particular circumstances when we as a Legislature are about to vote on perhaps the most significant piece of legislation that the government has presented and will present during the life of this Parliament, all the more so because, as we know, currently the government has a majority of some seven members in this Parliament. Certain of those members have publicly stated that they are prepared to vote against this measure and certainly some others will be considering that course right up until that vote is taken. I say to you, sir, for the Lieutenant Governor to make any statement whatever about the conduct of proceedings in this Legislature is the most vile breach of traditions, of executive authority in Ontario, and this Parliament, before this vote is taken, must do something about it.

I want to say to you first, sir, that I have the very deepest respect and regard for the Honourable Henry Jackman, the person who currently sits as the Lieutenant Governor in this province. He is an eminent citizen of some stature. He comes from a family of eminent citizens. His brother is a Catholic priest in my own riding. His sister was recently a candidate for election to this Legislature in the by-election in St George-St David.

The Honourable Henry Jackman is also a prominent business person in Ontario, in Canada and around the world. He has been a successful business person of

great integrity. I should say as well that throughout his career he has taken an active and I think important interest in the political process.

All of us welcome the fact that he was appointed Lieutenant Governor of this province on November 19, 1991, and sworn in on December 11, 1991. He has shown himself throughout his career to be a very strong and community-minded person, and we have welcomed him as our Lieutenant Governor.

I think it's appropriate for me to read into the record the remarks made by the Lieutenant Governor in London yesterday. I'm sorry to take the time of the House but I think it's absolutely imperative. These remarks are not lengthy and it's imperative that those words be on the record so that we can deliberate as to whether or not our privileges have been breached. The speech begins as follows:

"It is a privilege for me to be here. I am, as the chairman mentioned, the Lieutenant Governor of the province, which is a"—and then there is a part inaudible—"head of state. Therefore, I have the ultimate legitimacy and power given the Queen's representative, but in practical terms, it means you just shut up and do not exercise it." Apparently, the Lieutenant Governor did not take his own advice.

"The relationship between the Queen and the government is the same as between the Lieutenant Governor in Ontario and the Legislature. So the way it works out with my socialist Premier, Mr Rae, is that he gets all the flak and I get all the honour. It is the same relationship the Governor General has worked out successfully with Mr Mulroney.

"But I am not going to talk to you about the role of the Queen or the Queen's representative. Sufficient to say that I think in our system of government, the purpose of the sovereign is always to ensure that those who are elected do not take the law unto themselves, that there is a sovereign who is above them. And maybe the sovereign is the supreme head or the Lieutenant Governor in our case is just a symbolic... (inaudible) nevertheless acts as a sort of symbolic safety valve on the elected politicians. They must always recognize that they are subject to the law. So I really do the ceremonial stuff."

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I trust the member is not going to read the entire speech.

**Mr Sorbara:** I'm sorry, sir, but it's only a page and a half.

**The Speaker:** We've spent a fair bit of time already. If the member has a point of order, I would appreciate if he would get to it very quickly so that we can move on.

**Mr Sorbara:** Then I'll just go to the salient parts of the speech. He says at the conclusion of his speech, after describing the deficit situation of the government:

"The Premier, I felt very, very strongly, because of his labour background, felt that he had to ask the unions to be part of this decision that was affecting them. A lot of businessmen, a lot of editorial writers, said: 'Why are you asking them to cut their own throat? Why don't you just pass a law and say that's the way it's going to be?'"

"Well, from his perspective, from his background, as the leader of a party which is very heavily dependent on labour, he wanted to go through the exercise. The exercise so far has not been entirely successful. He has introduced legislation which will empower the employers to open up labour contracts and impose these cuts.

"I think there is no question about it, he means business. There is a New Democratic Party conference in Gananoque in a couple of days. He received the approval of his caucus and his party. Remember that, in his party, a lot of his ministers are former labour leaders themselves.

"I would say that I think he will prevail. I would say the strongest thing that Rae has going for him is that he is probably indispensable to the NDP party's survival. It's not like the Tory party in this country, where the Tories seem to have the luxury of debating whether they will keep the former Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, or keep the current Prime Minister, John Major, because they feel the party is stronger than the leader.

1540

"In Canada, in Ontario, without Bob Rae, the New Democratic Party would probably be nothing. I think they realize that themselves. So I think he will get his way. He's got a majority of 15 or 16 seats, I think. It doesn't take a lot of NDP ministers to vote with the opposition (to defeat the government). A couple of them said they would. He's had one minister resign on him. But he will prevail, I think, because his party knows that they cannot survive without him.

"And also he is sort of positioning the party on fiscal issues sort of on the conservative side"—

**The Speaker:** Could the member get to his point of order, please.

**Mr Sorbara:** —"and in terms of his concern for pay equity and the disabled and recognizing minority rights...then certainly on the left."

And this is the conclusion, sir:

"But I think Rae, although he is behind in the polls now, could easily win the next election. He got 38% of the popular vote because the opposition is split between the Liberals and the Conservatives. Whether he wins again I think will depend on how much the Liberals and the Conservatives..." and then it's inaudible.

"If the opposition to Rae coalesces behind one of the two right-wing parties"—

**The Speaker:** I ask the member for one last time to get to his point of order.

**Mr Sorbara:** —"then he would lose. If they don't, then I think there's a very good chance he would win."

Now, Mr Speaker, I am finished reading that part of the speech into the record.

I simply want to say to you, sir, this: The power of the Lieutenant Governor in this province is a very strong one indeed. I just want to review those powers for you.

**The Speaker:** Very quickly.

**Mr Sorbara:** He has the power to summon this Parliament into session. That is his power and his power alone. He has the power to dissolve this Parliament, and it is his power and his power alone. He has the power to withhold his consent to every act that this Parliament passes into law. Those powers reside in the Lieutenant Governor and they are exercised in this province on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen.

It is clear from every one of our traditions for 126 years in Ontario that the Lieutenant Governor and the Governor General, just as the Queen, do not interfere with the rights and privileges of members of this Legislature to consider legislation and pass it or defeat it.

I just want to quote you, sir.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Sorbara:** I'm telling my friends in the opposition that this is a matter of privileges, my privileges and yours.

**The Speaker:** The member is on very thin ice, and I ask the member to very succinctly get to his point of order.

**Mr Sorbara:** Mr Speaker, I reiterate this is not a point order; it's a point of privilege.

I'm referring to, sir, a volume entitled *The Office of Lieutenant Governor*. It was written by Professor John Saywell and published in 1986 by Copp Clark Pitman Ltd. I'm quoting from page 20. It reads as follows: "Political opinions publicly proclaimed are forbidden him."

What the Lieutenant Governor has done, either advertently or inadvertently, compromised my right in this Parliament to expect the possibility that the social contract he referred to in his speech and that we are required to vote on under business of the day, the next order of business. He has compromised the ability of this Parliament, having declared that he believes it will become law.

He has the right to sign that bill and he has the right to refuse to sign that bill, and before Parliament has considered it independently, as we are elected to do, the Honourable Harold Jackman has prejudiced our rights in that matter.

What's worse is that under his authority to dissolve Parliament, he has publicly made predictions as to the



possible outcome subsequent to the dissolution of this Parliament, suggesting to an audience in London but broadcast to an audience throughout Ontario and in Canada, the possibility that notwithstanding the current disfavour that the government is held in, Bob Rae could get re-elected.

I say to you that in 125 years of parliamentary and executive history in Ontario, we have never had a Lieutenant Governor comment in that way about the very political issues and the political climate in the jurisdiction for which he is responsible.

The insult that he proffered to the New Democratic Party is beside the point. I simply say that my rights to expect a fair and independent vote in this Legislature on Bill 48, the Social Contract Act, have been irreparably compromised by the remarks of the Lieutenant Governor. I plead with you, sir, that you adjourn this Parliament at this point, and now, until the Lieutenant Governor can come before this Parliament and—

**The Speaker:** May I say first to the member for York Centre that I appreciate very much the point which he raises. I understand—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Sorbara:** Yes, I've got authority like crazy here.

**The Speaker:** I'd ask the member to come to order. The member raised the point of privilege, I listened, and I ask him to listen. I appreciate the point of privilege which he has brought to my attention.

To the member for Bruce, I appreciate not only the concern which he raised, but why he raised it and the point in time in which he did, and the argument which he made.

The members will know that there is nothing which has been raised today which involves directly the Speaker of the assembly, nor the assembly itself.

**Mr Sorbara:** What about my privileges?

**The Speaker:** What the member has raised is a constitutional matter, and those matters are normally dealt with before the courts. It is not a matter for this assembly. It is not a matter for the Speaker.

SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The business that we're at is the deferred vote on Bill 48. There will

be a five-minute bell. Please call in the members.

*The division bells rang from 1547 to 1552.*

**The Speaker:** Would all members please take their seats.

Mr Laughren moves second reading of Bill 48. All those in favour of Mr Laughren's motion will please rise one by one.

**Ayes**

Abel, Allen, Arnott, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carr, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Cousens, Cunningham, Dadamo, Duignan, Eves, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jackson, Jamison, Johnson (Don Mills), Klopp, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Marland, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, McLean, Mills, Murdock (Sudbury), North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Runciman, Silipo, Stockwell, Swarbrick, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wes-senger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Simcoe West), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winniger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to Mr Laughren's motion will please rise one by one.

**Nays**

Beer, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Chiarelli, Cleary, Conway, Cordiano, Curling, Daigeler, Drainville, Eddy, Elston, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Haslam, Henderson, Kormos, Kwinter, Mahoney, McClelland, McGuinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Morrow, Murphy, O'Neil (Quinte), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Offer, Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Poirier, Poole, Ramsay, Ruprecht, Sola, Sorbara, Sullivan.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I ask the House to come to order so I can hear the vote count.

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 80, the nays 39.

**The Speaker:** The ayes being 80, the nays 39, I declare the motion carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Committee of the whole House?

The bill is ordered to committee of the whole House.

MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr Charlton moved government notice of motion number 5:

That, notwithstanding standing order 6(a)(i), the House shall continue to meet commencing Monday, June 28, 1993.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Does the government House leader have any opening remarks?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Just very briefly, because we've had some discussions here over the course of the last two weeks around time allocation motions and other items and around the government's agenda and the average amount of time that's been taken in debates in not only this session but all the sessions during this Parliament.

None of us like to sit here past the end of the normal adjournment for the session, but as I've said on a number of occasions, and I'd like to repeat again for members here today so that we all understand clearly what's happening here, throughout the course of this Parliament, ever since the election in September 1990, this House, thanks to the performance of the opposition, has been taking, on average, on every single piece of legislation, two and a half times the amount of time that was standard throughout the last decade under both the Conservative and Liberal administrations.

1600

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** Because your bills are so badly written. Because you are bringing forward bad bills.

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** You don't know how to deal with us to get things done. You don't know how to deal with the opposition. It is incompetence.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Obviously some members of the official opposition have some emotional difficulty dealing with the realities of legislative process, but that doesn't change the reality of the irresponsible way that both of the opposition parties have behaved during the last two and a half years. Members across the way can say as often as they like that it's been because of the way we've performed that has elicited their performance—

**Mrs Sullivan:** Write legislation that we can support. What do you do when you have 800 amendments to three bills?

**The Speaker:** The member for Halton Centre is out of order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** —but the reality is that their performance started on day one and hasn't stopped ever since.

Their performance continued on some of the legislation that they themselves prepared before they left office, and we still took two and a half times the amount of time that's normal in this Legislature to deal with some of the legislation which they themselves had prepared.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** You changed the rules yourself. You are incompetent.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** That, Mr Speaker, is simply bad losers. That simply is an opposition which isn't pre-

pared to be reasonable and responsible in the legislative process.

I'm not going to take up a lot of time this afternoon on this motion. This House is going to have to sit and, as I've said to both of the opposition House leaders, this House will sit until the legislative agenda that we've set before this House is completed. When the opposition parties are prepared to deal with that legislative agenda in a reasonable and responsible way, then we can talk about adjourning the House and going home and to our ridings—

**Mrs Caplan:** Let's hear it for democracy.

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Oriole, please come to order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** —for that normal break that we find during the summer.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** The member for Oriole, please come to order, and the member for Mississauga North. Let's try one person at a time. The government House leader.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I have completed my remarks, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate? A point of privilege.

**Mr O'Neil:** Mr Speaker, the House leader on the government side has gotten up this afternoon and has made certain accusations. Let me tell you that if any of the blame should be placed anywhere, it should be placed on his shoulders, because he is the one who has gone to our meetings demanding certain things rather than cooperating with our House leader. He is the one who is mainly to blame for all of the problems that he presently has.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Quinte will know that he does not have a point of privilege. However, he is certainly raising matters that are open for debate, and maybe he wishes to gain the floor to place his points of debate into the House.

Is there further debate on the motion?

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this motion this afternoon, and it may be at some length, because I want to make sure that all of the arguments on this matter are canvassed.

I first of all want to indicate, having heard the government House leader, that it reminded me—and he would remember this, because he was a member of the House, and a few other members—that in 1981, after the Progressive Conservative Party won the election, what used to happen was that virtually daily the Premier of the day, who at that time was Premier Davis, would come into the House, and when the opposition would express any doubt about the government policies or would be critical of the government in any significant



way, Premier Davis would remind the opposition of the realities of March 19. Members of the New Democratic Party were equally annoyed with members of the Liberal Party in opposition at that kind of arrogance.

The performance of the government House leader brings back that particular memory, because it seems to me that's the kind of lecture we're getting from the government House leader. We get the story that, "Well, you know, we won the election, so therefore you people should roll over and play dead and accept all of the legislation that comes forward, accept the new rules that the Premier has imposed upon the House," and so on.

I don't think that is the case. I look at the government as it puts forward its case for trying to get its legislation through the House, and I recall distinctly that, on many occasions during the winter and the early spring, at least weatherwise the early spring if not calendarwise the early spring, members of the opposition suggested that if the government had a very heavy agenda, it should in fact call the Legislature back at the appropriate time. The Legislature ended its sitting on December 10, 1992, and there was a lot of discussion at that time that we would be sitting through the Christmas holidays, well on into January. Then there were some questions that were forthcoming from the opposition that dealt with some rather embarrassing matters related to the government, and all of a sudden, I remember a question came from the member for Kenora to the Attorney General at the time, Mr Hampton, and that question prompted the government House leader of the day, Mr Cooke on that occasion, to fold the tent and finish the session.

Well, one would say the government is entitled to do that. People at that time of year are happy to be able to do their holiday shopping and to partake of the festivities of the year, so perhaps that was understandable at that time. But many thought that if the government agenda was that heavy, was that full, in fact what the government should be doing is calling the Legislature back, perhaps in January or February, certainly before the April 13 date which was subsequently chosen by the government. Now, that's a couple of weeks after what we would normally expect the House to sit, because we would normally expect it would have come back in March of this year.

I understand that when the government is developing its legislation and wants to get it through, perhaps it could have the House sitting for a longer period of time. Certainly we in the opposition would have been happy to cooperate with that particular initiative on the part of the government. It would have allowed for a fuller debate.

Now, people will say, particularly on the government side, particularly those who have served for the first time in the assembly, that they wonder why debates must be stretched out. They wonder why there must be

so much discussion of what they may consider to be bills that are relatively routine, in their view.

First of all, let me say that many of the bills that are proposed by this government are not routine. They do not represent the viewpoint, in my view, of the mainstream of Ontario. That doesn't mean that the government doesn't have the right to bring forward those bills. The government certainly does, as it's elected to govern.

1610

But it does mean that we in the opposition, and perhaps some of the government backbenchers, want to be able to discuss that legislation with a good deal of reasonable argument and debate.

In fact, many members of the governing party are concerned that they ran on what was called An Agenda for People. They find that today much of the legislation, many of the regulations and many of the policies do not reflect that Agenda for People. So members of the governing side from time to time want the opportunity to either explain why they have changed their minds or perhaps even to challenge the government itself.

It's essential that the public and the news media be made aware of all of the arguments. Often, if a bill goes through in one or two days, the public is not aware that this legislation is before the House and therefore may not be telephoning the constituency offices or writing to members or contacting them personally to express their views on legislation, and we lose out.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe there's a quorum present.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Could I ascertain if there is quorum in the House?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for St Catharines has the floor.

**Mr Bradley:** I'm pleased to see that a number of members on the government side have come back into the Legislature to take part in the debate, or at least to hear some of the arguments that are being put forth by the opposition. I do want to say—

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** Don't mention the third party. Please don't mention that there are no Conservatives in the House.

**Mr Bradley:** I will not mention that. There was an interjection that said there were no members of the Progressive Conservative Party in the House, and I'm going to ignore that particular interjection, which came from the government side.

Members, I know, are going to committee this afternoon and have many things to do, so from time to time I will expect that the odd member may not be giving full attention to my remarks, but I certainly hope

they will be listening with some degree of interest.

I was dealing with the issue of why we debate bills to a very great extent. What you find as a legislator is that the general public is not always aware of what happens in the Legislature. Many of us, I suppose, when we were home last weekend, were greeted with people who were saying to us, "I guess you people are on holidays now," because first of all, they interpret the House not sitting as being a holiday for members, not appreciating the fact that members have many other responsibilities that they must undertake, that they must meet besides being in the Legislature itself. But what they have seen is that the federal government has finished its session. The House of Commons is no longer in session. So there's a bit of an assumption that the Ontario Parliament must as well not be in session.

When important legislation comes forward—and some important bills are before this House, or at least some that are controversial—what we want to ensure is that the public is aware of all sides of the issue. We'd like the government to be able to present its case with perhaps ministers and other members of the government who want to put forward the case on behalf of the bills, and then I think it's important that members of the opposition talk about the parts of bills they support and those that they do not support. That way, the public, through the communications network that we have, the Ontario parliamentary network, get a chance to watch the debates and make judgements on those bills.

Members of the news media who are preoccupied with a number of issues that are there have an opportunity then to become acquainted with the arguments that are being put forward on many bills. I've found often both in government and opposition that the appreciation of the impact of legislation does not often come until several days into the debate.

I know, for instance, a classic example we use in this House is the member for Welland-Thorold, Mr Kormos, who expressed great opposition to legislation which was put forward by the last Liberal government in the field of automobile insurance. He spoke for, I believe, over 17 hours in the Legislature and got to the point where he was reading telephone numbers and people's names into the record, but the point of that was to acquaint people with what he felt were deficiencies in the bill.

Members of the government didn't agree, but we did have the opportunity to hear from various folks out there about the bill. They started to know what the bill was all about. Some of them agreed, some of them disagreed and some modifications were made to that bill somewhere along the line. That bill in fact, or another bill on automobile insurance, has come before this House once again.

That's the benefit of debate. I've heard people say, "All you people do in Parliament is talk," and yes, that is predominantly what happens. There are speeches

made, there are questions directed to ministers, there are various exchanges that take place, and I think they're exceedingly important. They're part of the parliamentary process, and those who have an appreciation of the importance of Parliament would recognize that it is not appropriate, nor is it wise in the long run, for the opposition to roll over and play dead at the sight of the government demanding that certain legislation be passed quickly.

There are certain bills that three parties have talked about that can pass rather quickly. Some of them have had extensive debate and are now ready for third reading, and I'm sure that the three House leaders have met and have made arrangements for those bills to pass rather quickly. There are other bills that the opposition feels deserve more debate, and the government has proposed a certain amount of time. The opposition has indicated whether it is prepared to accept those proposals or not, and that's as the House should work.

Unfortunately, there's been some considerable rancour when those meetings have taken place. It's not unusual, frankly, at this time of year, just as at the end of the fall session we tend to have that but, ultimately, we usually have an agreement of some kind on the legislation that should proceed and that which should be abandoned and that which perhaps should go to committee during the summer so that people can make direct representations to members of the Legislature.

I guess one of the most impassioned speeches, angry speeches that I've made in this House took place last summer—I think it was July 1992—when the Premier decided he would impose upon the House some drastic new rules which would have the effect of significantly limiting the role and opportunity of the opposition as well as many members of the government who are not members of the cabinet.

I felt that was unwise legislation on that occasion. I was angered because I know that the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition and when he sat in the federal Parliament, was a defender of the rights of parliamentarians, a person who believed that it was important that there be extensive debate on all legislation and policies and even some regulations indirectly that might come before this House.

I appreciated the Premier's arguments on those occasions when he made them in opposition in this House and he made them in opposition in the federal Parliament. I was therefore very disappointed to see that he would insist upon these new rules which would significantly restrict the powers of individual members of Parliament.

I think there's a danger in all of our institutions, that danger being that more and more power is concentrated in the hands of people who are not elected. It doesn't mean those people aren't clever. Many of them are highly intelligent. Many of them are pretty slick and



many of them are pretty clever. But they don't have the opportunity that members have to have an exchange with, a dialogue with their constituents to bring back the feelings in the ridings.

From the events that we attend, from walking down the street, from sitting in our constituency offices, from talking to people on the telephone or from receiving letters, we all have a pretty good feel for what the people are saying about the circumstances that face the province and what they believe are some of the solutions.

I suggest to you, Mr Speaker, and to members of the House, that that isn't always the case with those who are not elected. Senior members of the bureaucracy who give excellent advice and try to serve the province well don't have that opportunity to have the kind of interchanges we do with constituents, but most particularly, the members of the Premier's office, the group of people who surround the Premier.

I think the member for Welland-Thorold at one time referred to them in a less than complimentary manner. I won't repeat those, mainly because I can't find the quote at this time, but I will be simply trying to suggest in a general way what the member for Welland-Thorold had to say.

1620

The principle is correct. He was talking about people whose background is often Metropolitan Toronto, whose focus is often the provincial capital, and one of the problems that even politicians have, those of us who are elected representatives, is that when politicians get elected to the federal or provincial Parliament, they tend to spin a cocoon around themselves, to talk to one another. We talk to one another. We talk to the senior civil service. We talk to our personal advisers. We talk to the news media, which is the Queen's Park news media.

Out there in the hinterland beyond Queen's Park itself, even into suburban Toronto and perhaps downtown Toronto, but certainly into the many communities across Ontario, when we get into discussions about these matters, we often find that the views are different, that the viewpoint of what is needed for all of the province is often somewhat different from the kind of viewpoint that the chief advisers to the Premier might be exposed to. That's why I think it's important that this House have the kind of rules that permit extensive debate.

What did the Premier do in July of that year? He became annoyed because he was not happy with the way the legislation was progressing. So he decided, through Mr Cooke, the member for Windsor-Riverside and at the time the House leader, that he would bring in some new rules that would significantly restrict the role of the opposition, and those rules had certain effects.

First of all, the House was not to sit as many weeks as it previously had sat. I would guess that most people out there would like members to be in session as often as possible to deal with the important issues of the day, to question the ministry, to put forward government policies and programs. Yet what was happening was that as a result of these new rules, the House would sit fewer days.

What does this mean? It means for the Premier and his cabinet that they're not exposed to question period as often. They are not as accountable. They don't face what we call around here the scrum, that is, the group of reporters who are just outside this legislative chamber who ask members of the government and opposition their viewpoints on various issues. I think it's exceedingly important that that take place. It keeps all of us accountable.

As a minister in a previous government, I certainly know that kept me accountable in the House, to have the questions directed to me by the opposition and by members of my own government, and I know that running the gauntlet of the scrum outside was an exceedingly important exercise as well, because one again had to be accountable. It wasn't always pleasant, but it was a necessary part of our democratic system.

So I was very disappointed, and angered frankly, when the Premier insisted upon new rules for this House. While I cannot speak for other members of the House, Mr Speaker, I know that you, as an individual, have been a defender of parliamentary traditions. You have advanced many arguments for some changes in the rules which would be more beneficial than those that the government advocated and which would enhance the role of individual members instead of enhancing the role of the non-elected bureaucracy and the staff of the Premier. I think those are the kinds of rules that the government should have entertained rather than the rules which were imposed in July 1992.

We see a circumstance then as well where the government was going to control how long debate would take. So a minister today can virtually come into this House and state how long a debate will be on a bill the minister is interested in. That is not healthy for democracy, in my view. I'm not suggesting that the debate can go on for ever. I'm not suggesting that there aren't occasions when the public, if not the opposition, probably would support time allocation or a closure motion. I'm not suggesting that somewhere along the line of debate that might not happen. I'm simply suggesting that there's a great danger when ministers themselves come in and state how long there will be for debate on any one particular piece of legislation for which they are responsible.

A second part of that, an adjoining part of that that I'm concerned about is that the new rules took away from the Speaker some discretion that the Speaker had

in terms of the debate continuing. The Speaker is an important person in this House. Unlike the American system, where the Speaker has a different role, a much more partisan role and certainly a legislative leader type of role, in our Legislature the Speaker is a neutral person, even when that person is from one of the political parties.

I look at those who sit in the chair today from time to time: the present Speaker, the member for Victoria-Haliburton; the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, who is the number one Speaker, I guess we would say, in the Legislature; Mr Morin from Ottawa—he's from Carleton East—and Mr Villeneuve from Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry & East Grenville, I think is the last part of that riding.

I think all of those people have the respect of members of the Legislature as being quite neutral in their observations. There are times in the House when some of us become exercised at some of the decisions that are rendered by a Speaker, but I think everybody recognizes that they try to do a good job, and we recognize that the office of the Speaker is one which is different from others. The same can be said, I think, in the federal House of Commons. It has evolved that way.

There was a time when the Speaker's role in this House, and I think in the federal House of Commons, was a more partisan role than it is today, and I think that's an improvement. In fact in our Legislature the Speaker was actually elected in this particular case by members of the House as a whole, and I thought it was quite positive that this happened.

What happened was, having a neutral Speaker, having somebody who was objective in observing the debates and the proceedings of the House, the Premier decided, through the then government House leader, the member for Windsor-Riverside, that there would be some significant changes which would in fact diminish the power that the Speaker had in certain circumstances, and I don't think that's healthy for the system in this House.

In addition to this, what we see is that the individual members have less time to speak in this House because there's now an allocation of 90 minutes for a lead speech and 30 minutes for other speeches. Before we had those allocations, you found some members who might speak for eight or nine minutes on a piece of legislation and others who would speak for perhaps 40 or 50 minutes on a piece of legislation, but you found that members tended to speak the length of time that was required to put across a point. They may have had a very deep interest in a bill or may have had no interest in particular in a bill but wanted to make a few points on behalf of constituents.

What this has done is you're now seeing most members, at least on the opposition side, using the full 30 minutes or the full 90 minutes, because there's a fear

out there that at some time, quickly, the government is going to invoke closure. So they want to put as much on record as possible.

I think the flexibility of the other system was better. I think allowing members to speak for either a short period of time or a longer period of time allowed that kind of flexibility which allowed for the independence of members and the independent points of view of members and their relative concerns about issues before the House. I think we would avoid some of the more lengthy speeches that we see today if that were in fact in effect.

I watched in the federal Parliament—I know members of this Legislature would be critical of that which I'm going to speak about, that is, the NAFTA debate—the debate on the North American free trade agreement. I was appalled watching the limited amount of debate which was allowed on that particular piece of legislation. To me, that's a very significant piece of legislation. Its ramifications for our province and indeed for the whole country are very great indeed, yet I had to watch members get up and speak for eight or nine or 10 minutes on an issue which was extremely important to their constituencies and to the people whom they represented across the country.

I didn't think that was healthy. I thought that kind of debate should have allowed members to speak at much greater length and it should not have been cut off the way it was. They sat all night when people aren't necessarily up watching it and it becomes a bit of a charade.

Another debate I noticed where there was a limited amount of time was the constitutional debate. You, Mr Speaker, played a very significant role in the constitutional deliberations that took place. As a significant member of the committee, you had a deep and abiding interest that brought you to other provinces to talk to people about that and to try to resolve the constitutional differences that we had.

I found it disappointing at the very least and appalling probably at the most that again this Legislature was so limited in the amount of time it had to deal with that issue. Individual members had so little time that some of us gave up time to other members so they could make some kind of significant speech on it.

**1630**

I remember back in 1980, I guess it was, the referendum in Quebec; I think that was 1980. The former government House leader, the member for Riverside, is here. He'll remember well that debate. I thought it was a very good debate in this House, the referendum debate. Each one of us got an opportunity to speak. I was concerned that there wasn't the kind of time we would like to have had to deal with that issue, but I thought it had at least some impact on Quebec; not a major impact, but those of us in this province could



stand up and talk about why we wanted to see the province of Quebec stay, why we wanted the people of Quebec to vote against the proposition that was put forward by Mr Lévesque, who was the Premier at the time.

Those are the kinds of debates that I think are good in this House. I well recall some of the sittings when—I always look this way because the member for Lakeshore at the time, the late Pat Lawlor, who was deceased recently, and we're all saddened by his passing, gave some lengthy speeches in this House that were very good, that were very compelling.

Pat Lawlor or Jim Renwick—again a member who has passed on, who is no longer with us in this world—both of these individuals spoke at some length; Elmer Sopha from Sudbury, another person who spoke so eloquently; Stephen Lewis; the member for Hamilton Mountain at the time, or Hamilton Wentworth, Ian Deans; Farquhar Oliver; Bob Nixon: A lot of these people were in this House and made some excellent speeches that were of some length.

Premier Rae has decided that they will no longer have that opportunity; in fact, that they will be confined to 30 minutes except for the lead speaker. I think that's unfortunate and I think that flexibility should be there. That's one of the reasons why we are where we are at this point, in June 1993, and why we have this resolution before the House this afternoon.

I also want to indicate that there has been, in my view, plenty of time for this government to introduce its legislation and to get much of that legislation passed. The government always says, "Well, we have these bills, and Simcoe or Niagara or somebody's waiting for one of these bills." The government will find, if those bills are introduced, they can be processed rather quickly. There's usually an agreement and there's not a problem.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** Simcoe.

**Mr Bradley:** Whatever bill; it depends on what bill on Simcoe we're talking about. There are some bills that will go faster than others, as the member for Riverside most appropriately points out.

I think we can see that kind of legislation passed, but it's important that we not forego lengthy debate on some issues. Let me talk about one of those that I think might well appear. It's on the order paper.

We've had a good debate, by the way, on Sunday shopping. Again, it was splintered up. It was not as effective—perhaps if I thought the government had a machiavellian mind running it, I would say, with reason, that it was a splintered debate. I cannot make that judgement, because who am I to determine whether it is a machiavellian plot or whether it is simply coincidence that it is split up?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** You're paranoid.

**Mr Bradley:** The former House leader makes references which I should not respond to, that you would not want me to, about paranoia, something that seemed to plague him very much when he sat in the opposition benches but doesn't today.

I want to say that, for instance, when I look at the issue of casino gambling, I put that in the same category as Sunday shopping. What was nice, I guess, about the Sunday shopping debate was that members at least had an opportunity to vote the way they wanted to vote on that piece of legislation, except for the cabinet, and I understand that. I'm not critical of the fact that the cabinet must vote as a block. That's the way our parliamentary democracy works.

However, there was an opportunity for members to speak whatever way they wanted on the issue, all parties, in this case, and there was an opportunity for members to vote as they saw fit or to take a walk and not vote all if they did not want to vote against the government but still wanted to express an opinion by being absent.

Another debate that may be coming forward—I suspect, by the way, even though there is an opportunity for third reading on the Sunday shopping bill, the Retail Holidays Act bill, that there would be no further debate on third reading. Even though some would like to put the arguments further, I think there's been a decision of the Legislature. It was a pretty overwhelming decision, it was a non-whipped vote except for the cabinet, and I think people would accept that. I don't see that going to third reading expecting there's going to be more debate on it.

But I do look at the issue of casino gambling, an issue which has badly split the government benches. I understand why, and I don't say this in a critical sense, because there are many people who for a lifetime have opposed casino gambling as a revenue producer or as a social initiative or whatever category you wish to put it into, and who would like to express views on it. I know you, Mr Speaker, as the member for Victoria-Haliburton, as an individual who sits as an independent in this House today, largely over this particular issue, are a person who would like to see a rather lengthy debate and I would have hoped, for instance, that you would have an opportunity to speak at some length.

I had the chance to read the brief that you presented, that you provided for members of the Legislature, some rather interesting research on the subject. I think that's very helpful to the debate and what's going to happen in this Legislature. It may even persuade the member for Riverside to change his mind, though I somehow think in his circumstances that might not be the case. But it may persuade others to change their minds.

I think it's important that we have very extensive

debate on casino gambling. I happen to have one view; others have another view. My view is and has been consistently—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** What does this have to do with the motion?

**Mr Bradley:** —as it has come up over the years—the member asks what it has to do with the motion. I'm explaining some of the things that might be coming up as a result of this motion, some of the initiatives that I've seen on the order paper, and why we may wish to see the House continue to sit or not see the House continue to sit. Therefore, I think it's extremely relevant to what we're talking about and I somehow think this Speaker is not going to cut me off when I get on to casino gambling.

I want to say that I personally am adamantly opposed to casino gambling in this province, and I am opposed if my own city wants it. If my city of St Catharines requests it, I will still vote against casino gambling because I believe, in principle, fundamentally, that it is not good for the province, and I think an extensive debate should take place because there are others who may have different views that they wish to put forward.

The research that you have and research that was provided by the former Attorney General, now the Minister of Natural Resources, the member for Rainy River, when he was a young lawyer on the effects of casino gambling will be very helpful in this House. What I'm concerned about is even if the House continues, individuals who have important contributions to make will be limited to that 30 minutes. Now some members may not want to speak at all on the bill; some members may feel in five or 10 minutes they can canvass all of the issues and present their case; others will want to make a very extensive and comprehensive case either for or against casino gambling in this province.

I'm disappointed because I always looked to the New Democratic Party in certain areas to be the party that would prevent things from happening or make things happen. I happen to be a member of the Liberal Party. I agree most of the time with what the Liberal Party has to say. We have our caucus and we decide what our positions are on various issues, and sometimes I'm in agreement with the majority and there are times when I am not. I suspect that is of course the same in each caucus that is represented in this House.

I would hope that I would have the opportunity to make my case against casino gambling and perhaps persuade members of the House, particularly on the governing side, who are not as committed as the cabinet might be to a bill, to change their minds, to either be absent for a vote or perhaps to cast a vote against casino gambling.

I was very impressed with the arguments that the

present Premier, at one time opposition leader, has made over the years against casino gambling. In discussing with some of his former colleagues, who are not always as pleased with what he is doing today as they might be, I was informed that he was one of those who was most adamant in his opposition in years gone by to the introduction of casino gambling.

I think it could have a very detrimental effect and that's why I think there's need for an extensive debate. That's why I wonder why the government wants to rush through a bill of that kind in the kind of timetable that is proposed by the government House leader.

1640

I think, for instance, that members here who watch television from time to time, particularly news types of programs, may well recall, and I thought it was the best argument against casino gambling, the interview by Robert Scully of Donald Trump. While I recognize interviews can be edited—we've all gone through them, and sometimes a 30-minute interview turns out a four- or five-minute interview—I thought that Robert Scully really asked pertinent questions of Donald Trump.

Donald Trump wants to have the casino in Windsor. If they're going to have one, he's going to be in on the action. But he made some very good arguments against casino gambling, and when asked, "Would you think it'll benefit a community?" suggested it would not benefit that community and pointed out all the problems that arise. You get organized crime, no matter what you want, what you desire and the moves that you take. It's not that this government wants to see organized crime moving in; it doesn't, but it's inevitable that organized crime moves in when there's casino gambling.

What happens is the Treasurer is always happy to see more money coming in, so the Treasurer says this is a great cash cow for the province, and, "People are going to spend the money gambling somewhere anyway, so why don't we have one in Windsor?" or they could say Niagara Falls or they could say Ottawa; they could say particularly border areas.

What happens is that if it's the only game in town, it produces revenue. If it's got competition, that revenue diminishes considerably, but you still have the problems. I understand in Pennsylvania, though I don't have the information with me, they said when they had one casino, it was great in terms of revenue. When they had two, the problems began. When they had three or four, they started to see that it wasn't all that successful, and it's particularly so when adjacent jurisdictions begin to have casino gambling.

Now, members from the Windsor area would be aware of the plebiscites or referendums—I'm not sure which it is that they've had—the votes they've had in the city of Detroit for casino gambling or against it and it has consistently been turned down.



There was a difference, though, because my friend the member for York Centre, who has made some speeches on this, pointed out, and some of the petitions we presented said, that it had been turned down pretty substantially in the past. My understanding is that the last vote in Detroit was about 51-49 against casino gambling.

I would suggest to members of this House that the reason for that is the knowledge that the Ontario government wishes to proceed with the casino in Windsor. They see a loss of business to Windsor, so they are now throwing up their hands—some of them, at least, who opposed it in the past—and saying, “Well, if Windsor’s going to have it, we’re going to have one.”

**Hon Mr Cooke:** They haven’t had a public vote since we made the announcement.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** What’s that?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** They haven’t had a public vote since we made the announcement.

**Mr Bradley:** I understood they had.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** It was a vote in council.

**Mr Bradley:** It was at a council? It was 51-49, the last I heard.

Anyway, you can be certain that they will establish a casino in Detroit if there’s one in Windsor, and with the money Americans have, it’ll be a bigger, glitzier, more attractive casino than we’re going to have in Windsor, even though the government, when it’s placing its casino in Windsor, if it proceeds with this, would want it to be an appropriate building and appropriate operation.

So the compelling argument in terms of revenue begins to fade away as there are other casinos in border jurisdictions, and you still have the problems.

Now, it is said that it produces a lot of jobs. I can’t think of a party that has been more critical, with justification, than the New Democratic Party about wanting to replace high-paying jobs with low-paying jobs. Some people would be happy to have any job today, because it’s pretty tough times in the province and there’s a lot of unemployment. But these are not high-paying, lucrative jobs that you’re bringing to the community, with the exception of a few of the key jobs. I would suggest that the employment opportunities, when you look at the competition that’s going to be there, are not going to be as great as people had hoped for.

The local people, those who are involved in charities today running a very minor type of Monte Carlo nights where there’s not much money changing hands, are going to find that this eats, to a certain extent, into their opportunity to raise funds. I said this back actually when Wintario was introduced—I was a teacher at the time—in the staff room. I used to sell a lot of tickets because I belonged to a service club and you’d sell the

tickets on a small raffle, the turkeys or something like that. I found when Wintario came in, people would say, “Well, I’ve bought my Wintario ticket and I’m serving people in this province.”

So I think you’re going to have problems with casinos, and I suspect even the member for Etobicoke West, though he may not be opposed to them today, upon reflection, and I can’t speak for him, may find that they bring with them a good many problems. Certainly the local charity fund-raisers will be hurt.

The horse racing industry: One of my former colleagues, the member for Scarborough something, I think Scarborough Centre, Frank Drea, was an individual who knew something about horse racing when he was in this House. He was seen from time to time to be reading a racing form while sitting in the House. He was appointed to the Ontario Racing Commission in a senior role, and I think he would recognize that the horse racing industry, which produces a lot of jobs, would be hurt by casino gambling, and therefore people would want to see a very extensive debate on casino gambling in this House.

The other point I would make is that they will say that people will gamble, but the most glamorous kind of gambling, the most glitzy kind of gambling, is a casino. I would suggest that those who are addicted to casino gambling, and their families can speak best to this, will come in great numbers to squander their money and to lose their money in these casinos.

But what, I guess, is most disconcerting is that it’s the New Democratic Party that is implementing casino gambling, because the New Democratic Party as a whole has consistently and admirably been opposed to casino gambling. It has been a party which has stated its view that there should not be a tax on poor people in this province, yet the gambling initiatives really are a tax on those who are looking for the big chance to gain some wealth and to get ahead financially.

For that reason I’m very surprised that the party of Mel Swart—and I’m sure Mr Swart, whose birthday may even be today or tomorrow, I know he’s going to be celebrating a birthday this week, must be very concerned when he sees that an NDP government, that he fought for so long to get into power, would now be advocating casino gambling. That’s why I think that’s important.

I expect any Saturday now to read in the Toronto Star a column from Michele Landsberg, who writes with such objectivity on so many issues confronting the government. I’m sure Ms Landsberg would want to point out to people in the province the detrimental effects of casino gambling, as she has done so often in the very straightforward and objective manner with which she has dealt with issues that have confronted this government and others.

I want to say, as well, as I look down some of the notes that I made to myself here, that this issue of Sunday shopping having been disposed of, really was a situation where the government did a flip-flop. I had people in my constituency, and I'm sure other did around Ontario, who said: "Well, you know, you people in the Liberal Party are allowing municipalities to make their own choice, and we don't think that's good because a lot of them might opt for Sunday shopping. So we agree with Bob Rae and the New Democratic Party that we should have a common pause day."

I agreed personally with that point of view. As a member of the cabinet, one must support cabinet policy, but I agreed with the common pause day and I thought that, well, one of the consolation prizes of having an NDP government elected would be that there would be a common pause day, something with which many people agreed. But we found out, as the member for Etobicoke West may be surprised to find out, that in fact this government reversed its stand and the Premier says: "It's wide open. Holidays, Sundays, go to it. Shop till you drop." That is a departure from the other policy.

1650

I also looked at Bill 164, the auto insurance bill, and I thought if this had been introduced earlier, in a different time frame, we probably would not have to see an extension of the sitting of this House. Now Bill 164—and the member for Etobicoke West, who is sitting beside me, will correct me quietly and personally because he can't interject legally from where he is sitting, but would correct me if I am wrong—is this not contrary to what the NDP stood for in opposition?

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Jim, you're absolutely right.

**Mr Bradley:** I remember they were for public auto insurance, and while the other two parties in the House were not for public auto insurance because they felt there would be some problems with it, everyone felt that we—one of the pillars of the NDP, in terms of its platform, *An Agenda for People*, was its suggestion and its promise that we should have, as they called it, driver-owned, as we called it, government-run, automobile insurance, and they have backed away from that position. The Premier did a full retreat.

You start to date yourself when you remember television programs, but there used to be one called *The Silent Service*. They had all these sayings—it repeated itself very often. It was a submarine and you'd hear them say "Reverse engine" or "Right full rudder" or "All ahead full speed," and so on. Well, there's been a lot of reversing of engines in this particular case, and I have heard on many occasions, if others haven't, the bugles of retreat being sounded in this House on so many occasions where the government has reversed its position on fundamental party policy—

**Mr Stockwell:** Right full speed as well.

**Mr Bradley:** —right full speed as well—such as Bill 164, the auto insurance bill.

The member for Welland-Thorold, the present member for Welland-Thorold who campaigned so vigorously in favour of this, the former member for Welland-Thorold who used to rise in this House with issues related to automobile insurance, both had to be disappointed and would like to see, I'm sure, a more extensive debate in this House and would like to have seen this legislation introduced earlier so it could have received that kind of consideration. I suspect both of them would like to have seen the House back in February to deal with this kind of issue, instead of rushing at the last moment and imposing all kinds of time limitations on these debates.

It has once again been pointed out to me something that I mentioned earlier, but there may be people who are now watching the parliamentary network who weren't aware that the government did not sit for over four months. This Legislature was not allowed to sit because the Premier did not want to be confronted by the opposition in the daily question period and by the news media.

Another thing that I can understand being debated in this House would be the tax increases in the last budget. Every political party, every government has imposed some tax increases to pay for programs that have been suggested in this House and elsewhere, but I think most people would contend that those tax increases, at a time when we're in the midst of a very difficult recession, were ill timed.

I know the member for Wentworth East and the member for Welland-Thorold, who are in the public gallery today, as they often are consulting people of Ontario on various issues, would probably be ill at ease with some of the taxes that were imposed on people.

People out there must know that on July 1 the income tax is going to hit hard. It's not just the rich who are being taxed—although that's another issue, because we have to say that we want people to invest in this province, so it may not even be wise at this point in time to tax the rich—but also modest-income people who will feel the effects of a variety of taxes that have been imposed by this government.

I think most people will be quite surprised because, Mr Speaker, as you would know, in order to get a full year's revenue, the government is going to be double-taxing beginning July 1.

I also want to deal with the issue of polls. I know that in past years governments have been interested in polls. I've done polling with the taxpayers' money to see where everybody stands, but I heard speeches in the House the other day, and the Premier of this province certainly expressed his view on polling. He said it was an abuse of power, it was an abuse of democracy to



have governments taking taxpayers' dollars and polling to find out what the taxpayers or what those who replied to the questioners had to say and then implementing policy.

I remember a time when the NDP knew where it stood and didn't need polls to tell it where it stood, because they were fundamentally in favour of certain things and fundamentally opposed. So while I might have expected the other parties to engage in some polling, I well remember that the Premier, when in opposition, was so critical of this practice that I thought, in government, surely we will be able to count on our friend Bob to implement those principles as Premier of this province.

I put a request in to the freedom of information office and was able to—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for St Catharines is giving, I think, a very good speech and I think there should be a quorum here to hear it.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Acting Table Clerk (Ms Lisa Freedman):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for St Catharines has the floor.

**Mr Bradley:** I apologize to members of the House that I have to use a cough candy, but I have had some problems with my throat lately which are soothed by this. So I may not speak as clearly as I would like.

I want to thank the member for Etobicoke West for ensuring that there was a reasonable group of people here to listen to the compelling arguments that are being made on this particular resolution.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** One Tory and one other Liberal. That is how many people are in here to hear you.

**Mr Bradley:** Well, we're into polling and the cost of polling. The other day I met with—it was last Friday in fact, and I mentioned this is the House the other day—people who are respite workers and care givers associated with Alzheimer's patients. I found that they needed about \$25,000 in the Niagara region to be able to carry out a very good program, a program which was initiated by previous governments and carried on by this government; a great commitment to it, I think, by this government.

I was thinking on that morning the government had \$1.4 million to spend on polling to tell it what it thinks and yet it didn't have the \$25,000 which would allow this program to meet the needs within our area. It's a small amount of money.

I understand why, if it were \$24 million, the govern-

ment would be very cautious about committing; I understand that, even if it was \$2.4 million or something of that nature. But this is \$25,000, and I thought, how ironic that the government has money for polling, particularly when the Premier, in principle and ethically, opposed polling when in opposition, that they'd be squandering money on that. I hope the Premier will abandon it.

The Chair of the Management Board, who answered the question, said, "Well, you know, the previous governments had done this." The retort I had for that was that this particular government was always opposed to it, including the member for Ottawa Centre, who was always a person of principle in the past—still is. I would have thought that she would have opposed Bill Davis and the government doing that, but apparently she doesn't. She agrees that governments should be spending money to tell them what they think and then not share those results with the opposition or anybody else until they're forced to do so by a freedom of information request. That's exactly when you revealed them, when you got a freedom of information request. I am quite surprised that the government wasn't different on this issue.

But to go back to the respite workers who work with Alzheimer's patients, what I found difficult to accept was, here are people who have an Alzheimer's patient in the home who, 24 hours a day, must spend time with that person. Those people are often very ill, often very, very difficult to communicate with, and have to be virtually watched all of the time, according to the care givers.

**1700**

The respite workers come in for a maximum of 20 hours a week. Most people get much less service than the 20 hours, but at least that provides some break for the care giver to be able to get that person's life in order, perhaps to work at a part-time job, perhaps to do some shopping, perhaps just to not be confronted with the difficulties, the challenges, that a patient who has Alzheimer's in an advanced stage or some other dementia presents.

As to the respite workers, very dedicated people, who are prepared to work with those folks who are afflicted with Alzheimer's, what's happened is the government hasn't gone in with an axe and slashed without mercy, but we have more people in need of that service, and as a result, to maintain the number of hours, we find that it's very difficult, and that money is needed.

I'm not a person, and people in this House will note that, who is obsessed entirely with deficits. I think they're important to address. I think governments want to be efficient. But I think we always must remember that there are very vulnerable people in our society who will need our help. This case is a combination of vulnerability and a relatively low cost to meet a very

important need. I think that would have been advisable.

We get into government advertising, similar to polling. There are some advertisements the government puts in the newspaper or has on television or on radio that are informational and are needed for people. Some information is provided that way. Others have a pretty pronounced political tinge to them. They are most annoying because if a political party wishes to spend its money on such advertising, one can't object; that's political advertising.

But when governments do it—some of the members who sat here during the Davis years will well remember the "Life is Good, Ontario; Preserve It, Conserve It," which is a subliminal, and I think is the word they use, message that you should be happy with what's happening in Ontario; "preserve" and "conserve," of course, for Progressive Conservative. That was one. There was other blatant government advertising that would take place, self-congratulatory government advertising.

My concern is that it's creeping into this government as well. I know the frustration. The Premier and perhaps members of the cabinet believe that their message hasn't necessarily got out through the popular news media. Some in opposition may say they've received very favourable coverage. It depends on how one looks at it.

To circumvent the popular news media, they place ads in the newspapers. I thought it appalling last weekend to open the newspaper and look at full page advertisements with the Premier's letter, which was clearly the government line.

If the Premier wishes to make a speech in the House on that, or wishes to go to Sault Ste Marie and make a speech to explain to the people there, personally I think the Premier has every right to do that and to meet people directly to talk about it and to make his case whenever he can.

There's also free time broadcasting on CBC. I watched the Premier last week on it.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** It is an important initiative, you've got to admit.

**Mr Bradley:** It's certainly an important initiative; no one denies that. But I think that when governments spend a lot of money—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Bradley:** The Minister of Housing is intervening, and that reminds me of her rent control ads. They were one of the worst cases I've seen of blatant partisan advertising, your rent control ads, where you say, "Well, things were awful under previous governments, but we're the NDP and we fixed it for you." That wasn't even informational.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I am very proud of it.

**Mr Bradley:** That was a blatant case of political

advertising, and you should be ashamed of that because that is a classic case.

I'm not saying that there shouldn't be information out there; I agree there should be. I think the pamphlets that go out from time to time are helpful. But all that was, was a case of partisan advertising, and that's what annoys independent and objective observers. That money could be used to address the needs of vulnerable people in our society.

I was quite surprised and quite appalled to see on the front lawn of this Legislature not all that long ago people who are mentally challenged, people from various associations for community living who came to the Legislature because there was a possibility of funding being reduced or not provided to meet their needs for adequate sheltered workshops. These people came from all over the province. It wasn't simply the individuals themselves, it was, again, the staff people and others who were very concerned.

I know that in my part of the province, in my experience in this House, one group of people I have always felt deserved to have their needs met are those who are vulnerable in that case. Now, there are other people in that situation. There was a person by the name of—

**Mr Martin:** They were happy.

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Sault Ste Marie says they were happy, but they weren't happy with an NDP government, to have to come to Queen's Park to make that case on the steps of Queen's Park under an NDP government.

Another kind of person, another young individual whose parents would certainly want to see some assistance from this government, as opposed to government advertising or polling, would be the parents of Sarah McLaughlin. I received a very difficult letter, quite obviously, for the people to write about their daughter and all the difficulties their daughter faced and I raised it in the Legislature. I don't like using names in the Legislature, but these people asked that this issue be raised because their daughter was facing this situation.

I'll just read a couple of excerpts from the letter because I think it's important. They want that to be known because their need is out there. It says:

"I am writing to you with regard to our daughter, Sarah McLaughlin. We urgently need your support to help us obtain more hours of intervention"—that is in the home itself—"with her in-home special needs worker.

"Sarah is a 19-month-old, deaf and blind, developmentally delayed child. She has infantile spasms, which are a form of epileptic seizures. Last year, she was experiencing 50 to 100 seizures per day."

She also has other problems, "microcephalic, which means her head and brain are smaller than normal, and possibly she is mentally handicapped."



That's what it says in the letter here.

What they're asking for essentially is a worker who has special training, special education, who can enhance the quality of life of this young person. Yet because of cutbacks, that person will not be able to receive that kind of help.

That's why when I see the advertising, when I see the polling, when I see some of the questionable expenditures, I say better to place it with people of this kind.

If the House can't deal with these issues, if the House is never sitting or seldom sitting under the regular rules, we don't have those chances to raise those issues. I hope we can address the needs of that person. I don't think there's anybody in this Legislature who would want to see those needs not addressed.

I could go on with many others. There are other examples of people who believe that some of the legislation the government is bringing forward would not be positive for the province and that other of the legislation would certainly require some amendment, some improvement. Sometimes basically the legislation is good, but there is a need for that kind of change.

Matters of health care in this province: I well recall, sitting on the other side of the House and in fact sitting on this side of the House years ago, the number of questions which were directed to the Minister of Health about improving the quality of health care in the province. What I see happening to our health care system is alarming, because I see—in some cases, some positive things; I don't want to be totally negative; I see some positive things—a deterioration of the service that's going to be available in this province in the field of health care.

I think some of the decisions that are being made are unwise. Others should be supported. Some are as a result of work that started back perhaps when the Conservatives were in power. The Liberals worked with it for a while. The New Democrats are making some fine-tuning changes and so on and some of that can be supported and should be supported.

1710

But I'm quite alarmed that the health care system is not going to be able to address the needs of this province much more into the future. I'm also mindful of the cost. It's a very great cost. I always say to people, these days particularly when we're in difficult economic times, that if you want these services there is a cost to them. That cost is going to be addressed by either borrowing the money to purchase those services, to provide those services, or it's going to mean more taxes, or it's going to mean that governments are going to have to eliminate some programs, projects and initiatives that the people might like to have but cannot be sustained if we're to provide adequate health care. I think health care issues should be paramount in this

House over the next several months.

The problems facing farmers are also great. I don't represent a farming community, but there are many farmers around. My interest is twofold: one, in ensuring that the family farm can survive and that farming is a viable operation in Ontario—I think it's an important business; the second is the saving of agricultural land.

I become alarmed when I see municipalities gobbling up agricultural land. I understand farmers who wish to sell their land or sever it, because they simply can't make the kind of profit that makes it viable.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food has been endeavouring to persuade his colleagues to provide conservation easements in the Niagara Peninsula so that we can retain some of that unique farm land for farming purposes, rather than having individuals sell it off for development purposes.

When I first started to go to Toronto 16 years ago, it used to be a rather scenic drive between St Catharines and Toronto. If I went on the train or the bus, you saw the farm land, you saw the fruit land and you kind of had a good feeling about our part of Ontario. Today I look along the same road and there are warehouses. They're not operations that are providing a lot of employment, but they're eating up good agricultural land. The reason they are is that it is not easy to be a farmer in Ontario at this time and hasn't been for a period of time.

I think the conservation easements allow for the retention of agricultural land. Stephen Lewis made it a big issue in his earlier days in the 1970s in this Parliament. The Globe and Mail used to write about it an awful lot in years gone by as an important issue, and I think it remains an important issue because there are some people who believe that, unless you pave every last centimetre of land, somehow you're not putting it to its best use. I don't agree with that. So I implore people to support the government in the initiative.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for York Centre, on a point of order.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This is a very important speech by the member for St Catharines and I think it's important that the government provide a quorum for this House.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Acting Table Clerk:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present, The honourable member for St Catharines has the floor.

**Mr Bradley:** One of the issues I hoped might have been dealt with again—in addition to the farm land,

which I think it is exceedingly important that we retain, because it's not only for our purposes, it's for future generations and other parts of the world. We have some lush farm land down in southwestern Ontario; We have some in the Niagara Peninsula.

I was disappointed to see that the city of London was allowed to consume, to gobble up so much of that land, put it inside its boundaries. I know it's easy to say that just because it's inside its boundaries doesn't mean it's going to get developed. The chances are much greater that it will.

When I think of the future, yes, the prices are low today, but they're low to a certain extent because there's some competition locally, some competition in Ontario. Take away that competition, take away that source of food in our province, and we will find that indeed those prices will increase.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It's amazing; only a minute has gone by and there's no longer a quorum. The government is not holding the quorum.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Acting Table Clerk:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for St Catharines has the floor.

**Mr Bradley:** In addition to the situation with farm land and the disappearance of farm land in our province, I also have a concern—and Mr Sewell was here, John Sewell, and his commission. Mr Penfold I think was with him at the time, and Toby Vigod was with him as well, the three-person commission. I thought that one of the issues they could have addressed was in fact that of the Niagara Escarpment.

There are people out there who are now endeavouring to erode the jurisdiction of the Niagara Escarpment. Many of them come out and state that they are actually interested in the escarpment and they're home owners and they simply want to enhance its beauty and perhaps add something to it.

We have to remember that the Niagara Escarpment has many enemies. The enemies are those who want to develop, again, some of the most beautiful land that we have. The United Nations consider it to be a biosphere, a very important environmental treasure that we have in the province.

I listened with interest and read with interest the report that the hearing officers had on the five-year plan. It alarms me, some of the conclusions that they reached.

There's a bit of a lull now in the environmental movement. They are unable to raise the funds they once

had. They certainly aren't able to grab the media attention that they once were able to grab. Indeed, if an environmental question is asked in this Legislature, there is seldom much coverage of it. That is totally in contrast to half a dozen years ago when in fact that would always be a matter of great interest.

I think the Niagara Escarpment can slip away from us, not in one stroke of the pen, but it can slip away from us by allowing a severance here, a subdivision there and a development here. Eventually, one argument leads to the next argument.

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** Death by a thousand cuts.

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Durham West certainly uses the proper terminology of "death by a thousand cuts," because we start to say that it's all right here, it's all right here, it's all right here, and finally we find out that the escarpment in effect is gone. So I hope members of the governing side will keep pressure on the cabinet and that the cabinet itself will take the initiative to preserve our escarpment.

I'm also concerned—and I know that the Legislature would want to deal with matters of this kind if it were back earlier—with the situation facing university students and community college students, both in terms of their employment opportunities this summer so that they can help to put themselves through college or university, or those who are leaving college and university and don't have a chance immediately to find some kind of reasonable employment position.

1720

But what's even more alarming is the fact that it's becoming much more expensive to go to school. One of the items I would have found in the Agenda for People, which everybody would remember, was in fact the promise that there would be an elimination of tuition for students. This may have been an unrealistic promise. I think a lot of people thought it would be implemented. I guess what is disconcerting is that not only has that promise not been kept—

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Since we are debating whether we will be extending the sittings, I think it would be appropriate if we had a quorum, and I don't believe there's one present.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum in the House.

**Acting Table Clerk:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for St Catharines has the floor.

**Mr Bradley:** The people going to college or university find that their tuition fees have increased, that they can no longer get a grant to assist them to go to univer-



sity—it's now all a loan—and that the number of spaces available in our colleges and universities have diminished rather considerably, or will at least in this particular year.

A lot of young people seeking higher education, seeking to prepare themselves for a very competitive future in this world, are finding that as a result of government policy, as a result of the downturn in the economy, they won't have that opportunity, or at least the sacrifice will be very, very significant in terms of mortgaging their future with student loans.

On behalf of those people and their parents, I think those of us in this assembly should be initiating action to ensure that they are able to go to school and that we don't have a situation where they're denied that opportunity well into the future.

We also have, if I may be a bit parochial, but it applies to all of Ontario, a circumstance where there was a policy on the part of the government of David Peterson to share government ministries with other parts of the province. We in St Catharines had the opportunity to have the Ministry of Transportation located in the city, bringing what we thought would be 1,400 jobs to our community.

There's quite a history to this. I won't go into the details of it, but there was considerable opposition on the part of the government to proceeding with that. I understand that when a government is new it has the opportunity and the right to evaluate the policies of a previous government and either proceed in that direction or not.

But it was almost a case of dragging the government, kicking and screaming, into maintaining this policy. I would suggest that had it not been for the other unfortunate circumstances confronting our city, such as the unemployment as a result of announcements made by General Motors, we might not even have the Ministry of Transportation there.

We had some bad news this week with that move, that in fact the number of jobs is reduced by some 400, and so many people who had anticipated being able to obtain employment positions and many who anticipated that they would have the opportunity to service the ministry are disappointed this week that this is the result.

I can recall raising this issue in the House. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was in a huff. He was at that time Minister of Transportation. I suggested that the government was reconsidering its moves to various communities and he said, "Well, you're rumour-mongering and you're simply scaring people in your community." I would ask it of the Premier and ask it of other members of the government.

The reason was quite simple. I know what governments go through. The government is evaluating all of

its options in terms of its reduction of spending, and it was essential to raise this issue in the House and on other public platforms in order that the government would be persuaded to proceed with that move. I am pleased that the government has confirmed it is going to move those jobs, but I am concerned that there are only 1,000 instead of 1,400.

Members of this House will be aware that the Niagara Peninsula, and specifically St Catharines, has been hit with some very bad news over the last year and a half. The first bit of bad news was the announcement of the closing of the foundry in St Catharines and a portion of the engine plant, though a small portion, as well as some 750 people being laid off indefinitely. Between the engine plant and the foundry, the total jobs lost, along with those indefinite layoffs, would be about 3,000. Subsequent to that, several months later we had an announcement that General Motors was going to sell its axle division.

These are very efficient plants. We had good workers in them who are dedicated people trying to make them viable operations, efficient operations, and yet the announcements were made that the plants would be closed in one case and sold in the other.

I suggested at the time, though I recognize that only one of the many factors General Motors takes into account is the provincial government, that I didn't think that was a positive consideration for General Motors. Not that it was the reason they moved out or closed down, it would be unfair to suggest that, but that it was definitely a negative factor.

I suggested that the Premier go to Detroit on that occasion to speak to the top people in General Motors to try to persuade them that Ontario would be a good place to maintain operations. The Premier didn't think that was as good an idea. He headed off on a trip to Asia and he headed off on a trip to Europe—both important. Unfortunately, they were both while the House was sitting, which I object to, but I'm not suggesting the Premier shouldn't take those kinds of initiatives when the House is not sitting and in an appropriate time.

I would have thought his time would have been better spent on that occasion going to Detroit, however. He's a persuasive individual; he is a well-spoken articulate individual, I think respected in many areas, and I think his presence in Detroit would have been helpful. Had he not been successful in changing the minds of the top people at General Motors, I would not have been critical. I would have been, I think, appropriately supportive of the fact that he at least made an effort.

Unfortunately, that chance has passed by and the trip to Asia and the trip to Europe I don't think were as productive in retaining those jobs as would have been a trip to the city of Detroit. But I hope in the future if that happens that our Premier will meet with those top

people in General Motors.

I had someone stop me outside the other day and say: "Don't you realize General Motors' address in the phone book is in Oshawa? That's the headquarters of General Motors." Well, I'm sure members of the New Democratic Party would know that General Motors is not run from Oshawa. Although we have people there in managerial positions who make certain decisions, ultimately the decisions are made in either Detroit or New York for General Motors. That's why I think it's going to be important for us to try to retain those jobs with the persuasion of the Premier and the government, because there are many sad people in our community.

Let me tell members of the House, the effects aren't there yet. I mean, for some people they are, the 750 who are indefinitely laid off—"indefinitely" in this case means for a long, long period of time—are on the rolls, but the full effect of the closing of the foundry, which isn't coming for a while yet, is not felt in the community, and of the selling and potential closing—we hope not—of the axle plant.

So it seems to me that we will have to develop in this Legislature—and certainly the government taking the initiative—the kind of policies which will encourage people to invest in Ontario. For some members of the New Democratic Party it may be difficult to countenance those. For instance, the Treasurer brought in a tax in this particular budget that's very attractive to the average person in this province. It's the minimum corporate tax. I think most people in most circumstances would say, "Sure, everybody should pay some kind of tax."

Unfortunately, we're in a very, very competitive world, not only with competition from the US, but also from offshore and other places—Europe, Asia, even South America—today. It seems to me that we have to gear many of our policies to attracting investment, and second—this is why, of course, we need a side agreement at the very least to the NAFTA agreement, which I wish they would abandon—you have to gear your policies to attracting and maintaining investment.

1730

This should not be at the sacrifice of some of the essentials that we feel are important in this country. I don't think this government is going to do that. I don't think any government should do that. But it may be that some of the tax increases or tax changes that appear attractive to most of us as average citizens in this province should be either postponed or abandoned so that this business will stay in Ontario.

One of the suggestions I've made is that the gas guzzler tax, as it's referred to—I call it the tax on auto workers—be removed for the following reason: Anybody who makes a purchase of a vehicle recognizes the huge taxes, the GST, the PST, the gas guzzler tax, an air-conditioning tax and all kinds of other little costs

that go with a vehicle. It seems to me if the Treasurer would abandon the tax on auto workers, the so-called gas guzzler tax, it would encourage people to purchase new vehicles. When they purchase new vehicles and replace their old clunkers they solve an environmental problem to a certain extent and they help to solve an economic problem.

First of all, if people are making the purchases, then people in St Catharines, Windsor, Oakville, Oshawa, St Thomas, London and any place around Ontario—Alliston and other places—who are going to make purchases may choose to purchase a vehicle, so it helps the economy and gets it moving again. The auto industry is extremely important to all of us.

Second, the newer vehicles that are purchased are, by and large, vehicles that have better fuel efficiency and certainly have better emission controls as far as pollution control equipment is concerned. I think that's a positive suggestion we in the opposition have offered on many occasions that would help Ontario and certainly help the automotive industry.

There are so many things that could be done in the province if we could get the economy moving again. It seems to me that getting the economy moving again, getting job opportunities available again and getting people back to work is the main priority of all of us. I think that would in the long term, and perhaps even in the medium term, address many of our problems of the deficit.

I've mentioned on a couple of occasions that I think the Premier and perhaps the Treasurer have been spooked a bit by two things, and I notice the Fraser Institute has now put out a booklet on it. They have been spooked by the New Zealand story on W5 and by the people who loan money and have the credit ratings in New York, both of whom have given some dire warnings to this government that if it doesn't drastically change its ways, somehow the world will end. Certainly, the government has to move in that direction, and perhaps if I wanted to look in retrospect, should have moved in that direction in the first year of the recession, but that's gone by. They should move to address that.

On the other hand, I think we always have to remember that most people I meet, and I think that most members meet, are concerned about their jobs and job opportunities.

Once they get back to work, once they're spending money on services and goods, once they have confidence back again, perhaps even making some investments on their own, we'll find that a lot of the services that we want in this province—the Niagara Peninsula children's centre, for instance, which requires some money from the Ministry of Health, and I've made representations to the minister to provide that from within the present allocation that she has; I'm not asking for new ones, just putting the priority for our



own area—with increased revenues and increased stimulus to the economy, many of those social needs will be able to be met.

The conservation authorities, for instance, that have been hit with a new tax change by the provincial Treasurer, will not then have to sell off environmentally sensitive land in order to meet their financial obligations. Again, even people who are not environmentalists in the province, who are conservationists, would consider it important that these lands be retained for future generations and not lost to the tax man.

We have so many problems we could deal with in the province, so many reasons why we should be dealing with some important legislation that I suspect when the House leaders get together, they will try to establish some priorities: the government indicating what it considers to be its priorities, the opposition indicating what amount of debate will be necessary to carry out its responsibilities.

I know when I spoke to service clubs, both in opposition and in government, particularly in government, I always took time to point out the importance of the opposition and the role the opposition plays. I know when you're in government, the opposition appears to be annoying.

Some of my colleagues in the cabinet in which I sat who had never sat in the Legislature had a somewhat different point of view than those of us who had sat in opposition. It's not that we agreed with what the opposition was doing necessarily, those who had served for a number of years, but we understood how the place worked and why the opposition was doing certain things. It's nice when there's a blend of both those who have served for some period of time and new people in a cabinet, to get a different perspective.

I understand why the government is eager to get out of the House. When I was in government, I can recall that my colleagues and I did not always want to be sitting in the Legislature, because there's other work that ministers want to do, other work that committees want to do. Nevertheless, it was a responsibility to be accountable to the House.

I'm one who believes that I'm prepared to sit all summer. Now, everybody says that. The government always says, "We're prepared to sit all summer," but there isn't anybody who's sat in government who doesn't know that the government doesn't want to sit all summer.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Well, let the motion pass.

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Windsor-Riverside says he wants the motion to pass. It may or may not pass. The government has a majority. There may be some members of the governing side who, having listened to my remarks, have changed their minds and are prepared to either not vote and leave the House or some may be showing the kind of principle and personal initiative to actually oppose the government on this issue.

I've endeavoured, certainly over the period of time that I have spoken to the House this afternoon, to be persuasive. I've noted the attentiveness of those who were able to make it this afternoon. I think I've had the opportunity to persuade some. Certainly, there has been some nodding on the other side when I've been speaking and I hope it's not nodding off that I've seen. But I'm the eternal optimist and I always believe that where there is life, there is hope. We have life on the other benches, I think, and therefore we have hope that the government will change its mind.

I hope the government House leader will be a reasonable person. I know the opposition House leaders will be very reasonable. I think matters can be resolved with reasonable people dealing with them.

I implore members of the government to put the necessary pressure on the Premier, who runs everything, and the person who carries out his responsibilities, the government House leader, to act in a responsible way, to abandon unwise legislation and to proceed with legislation that may be of benefit to this province. Thank you very much for the opportunity to address the House.

*Report continues in volume B.*





## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 23 juin 1993

### PÉTITIONS

#### **Contrat social**

M. Poirier . . . . . 1859

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

#### **Loi de 1993 modifiant le Code des**

**droits de la personne, projet de loi 55**

M. Cousens . . . . . 1862

#### **Loi de 1993 sur la protection des droits**

**civils, projet de loi 56**

M. Harnick . . . . . 1862

# CONTENTS

Wednesday 23 June 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Transfer payments</b>	
Mr Callahan	1843
<b>Sale of fish</b>	
Mr McLean	1843
<b>Emancipation celebrations</b>	
Ms Haeck	1843
<b>Tax and fee increases</b>	
Mr Miclash	1844
<b>Health services</b>	
Mr Wilson	1844
<b>Metropolitan Agencies</b>	
<b>Representatives' Council</b>	
Mr Owens	1844
<b>Northern education services</b>	
Mr Beer	1845
<b>Volunteer firefighters</b>	
Mr Eves	1845
<b>Oshawa Fiesta</b>	
Mr White	1845

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs McLeod	1848
Mr Rae	1848, 1851, 1856
Mr Harris	1851
Mr Offer	1856
<b>Ontario Training and Adjustment Board</b>	
Mrs McLeod	1849, 1858
Mr Cooke	1850, 1857
<b>York Detention Centre</b>	
Mr Jackson	1852
Mr Silipo	1852
<b>Wage protection</b>	
Mr Mahoney	1854
Mr Mackenzie	1854
<b>Interprovincial trade</b>	
Mr Harris	1854
Ms Lankin	1855
<b>Landfill</b>	
Mr Wiseman	1855
Mr Wildman	1856

## Race relations

Mr Cousens	1856
Mrs Boyd	1857
Mr Harnick	1857
<b>Trucking industry</b>	
Mr Daigeler	1858
Mr Pouliot	1858

## PETITIONS

<b>Bruce generating station</b>	
Mr Elston	1858
<b>Health care</b>	
Mr Murdoch	1858
<b>Justice system</b>	
Mr O'Connor	1858
<b>Historic vehicles</b>	
Mr Runciman	1859
<b>Accessory apartments</b>	
Mr Hope	1859
Mr Callahan	1861
<b>Sheltered workshops</b>	
Mrs O'Neill	1859
<b>Automobile insurance</b>	
Mr Murdoch	1859
<b>Gambling</b>	
Mr Drainville	1860
Mr Hansen	1860
<b>Drug benefits</b>	
Mrs Sullivan	1860
<b>Landfill</b>	
Mr Cousens	1860
<b>Water quality</b>	
Mrs MacKinnon	1860
<b>GO bus service</b>	
Mr Tilson	1861

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

<b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills</b>	
Ms Haeck	1861

## FIRST READINGS

<b>City of Toronto Act, 1993, Bill Pr43</b>	
Mr Marchese	1862
<b>Human Rights Code Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 55</b>	
Mr Cousens	1862
<b>Civil Rights Protection Act, 1993, Bill 56</b>	
Mr Harnick	1862
<b>City of Toronto Act, 1993, Bill Pr44</b>	
Mr Marchese	1862

## SECOND READINGS

<b>Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48</b>	
Mr Laughren	1865

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION

<b>Meetings of the house, government notice of motion number 5</b>	
Mr Charlton	1866
Mr Bradley	1866

## OTHER BUSINESS

<b>Members' expenditures</b>	
The Speaker	1843
<b>Report, Commission on Conflict of Interest</b>	
The Speaker	1843
<b>Visitors</b>	
The Speaker	1845
<b>Parliamentary process</b>	
Mr McGuinty	1846
Mr Callahan	1847
Mr Sorbara	1847
Mr Charlton	1848
The Speaker	1848
<b>Lieutenant Governor's comments</b>	
Mr Elston	1862
Mr Sorbara	1863

*Continued overleaf*



C1204  
11  
-223  
No. 37B



N° 37B

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 23 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 23 juin 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Wednesday 23 June 1993

*Report continued from volume A.*

1740

## MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Further debate, the member for Oakville South.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** Is that questions or comments or full debate?

**The Deputy Speaker:** No, it's not questions or comments. It's debate.

**Mr Carr:** Okay, good. Settle back, folks, I have a few things I'd like to say.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** No questions or comments?

**Mr Carr:** You can go to dinner now, Chris.

I think most of the members of this Legislature would probably be willing to sit had we really come up with some initiatives over the last little while, but since I've been here there really have been no new initiatives.

I think all of us in this Legislature have come in here wanting to do a good job for our constituents. I was one of those people who ran in September 1990. Because I was so upset and discouraged with what was happening, I decided to get involved. I think many of the members would be prepared to sit around 24 hours a day, seven days a week, if they really felt they were making an impact on what was happening, but as I sit here day after day and look at the legislation, I'm afraid I am somewhat discouraged, because I don't believe we are making very much of an impact.

When I look at the legislation that's going to be coming forward over the next little while that we'll be debating when we extend the hours, there isn't anything in there that is relevant to the people of my riding.

We are in an economic crisis. We are now getting, myself personally, about 80 calls a day from people who are upset with what is happening in the province of Ontario. That's just my constituency office; I get a few more here at Queen's Park. I want to tell you how depressing it is, Mr Speaker, because we've got people who are saying that they're going to leave the province. I had three calls last week from people who are so upset, they called, "Mr Carr, we just wanted to let you know we're leaving because of the high taxation and the many problems."

I think many people would feel it would be worthwhile extending—and I will say right off the bat to all the members I'm in favour of extending the amount of time, notwithstanding the fact that what we're doing here really isn't affecting the average person out in my constituency. Those people would say that you should be staying and dealing with the legislation, and I think

a lot of them probably would postpone their plans to move to other jurisdictions, whether it's Quebec or Manitoba or the United States, if they honestly, truly thought there was going to be something done and there was some hope and some opportunity.

I must say, with this government there is not. People are counting down the days till this government can be defeated. I personally think, with some of the initiatives that are on the order paper now—good speech, I say to the member for St Catharines. I had planned to get up and say that. I thought it was actually two minutes when I got up, and I appreciate his input, as he's speaking with the people at Hansard and trying to organize. I thought he brought some very excellent points.

But most of these people, if they honestly, truly believed that we were going to be effecting some change, I think would see some hope and opportunity. But as I look at the order paper and what we're going to be dealing with, very little is going to change and bring hope and opportunity to the people who are out there.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the issues that I wish we were addressing. Had we been dealing with bills such as crime and community safety, I think I probably would have been more willing to stay and debate, but there's nothing on that issue. It's gone so far that our caucus, the PC caucus, has had to initiate our own task force. Since I've been here, in the two and a half years there's been very little talk about crime—and I'll get into some of the statistics in a minute—even though that's a number one problem. My friend from Don Mills—I campaigned with him—will know very well from the last by-election, one of the major issues is the issue of crime and community safety, and that's not being addressed.

We had to go so far as to set up our own task force on crime and community safety. It's our intention to hold a series of public hearings to deal with this issue. I wish we could as part of the debates be dealing with it here. We are not. It's our intention to hold some public hearings over the next little while to consult with the people of this province, the people who are feeling frustrated with the statistics on what's happening. There's public concern. That isn't being dealt with, I say to the members opposite, and I honestly, truly believe if we were sitting here debating on what to do on some of these important critical issues, people would feel better about what we're doing.

So on the one hand I say that we all are interested in working hard and spending the amount of time that needs to be done here, but this House is not dealing with issues that are important to the people out there, like the people who are concerned about crime.

We aren't dealing with a lot of the issues like pornography: the Ontario Film Review Board audit and video stores. My friend the member for Mississauga South has brought this up continually, day after day, in question period. I guess by extending the sittings we're going to get a good chance to deal with the government and put more pressure on it as we sit here, but there's no legislation coming in that's dealing with that, no bills that are going to assist the people who are concerned about that.

There's no bill on the victims' bill of rights. My friend and colleague the member for Burlington South has a bill before the justice committee. This is his third go-round for the issue of a victims' bills of rights. Most people would say we should be here in the Legislature dealing with that very fundamental bill, but we are not, and hopefully over the next little while, if we extend the sittings as a result of this motion, we will deal with that very important issue.

This weekend, for example, I'm going to be going to a rally in the Burlington portion of my riding that will be attended by people like Mrs de Villiers, who had the tragedy of losing her daughter, who has spoken out a great deal on the victims' bill of rights and what should be done, and I say to the members opposite, we are not dealing with any of the issues that are going to really create a better Ontario when you look at the bills that will be coming up.

On the same issue, the same thing of law and order, I introduced a petition with about 720 names. I think it's probably the biggest petition that I have introduced into this Legislature: 720 names. It was dealing with Bill 114, which I guess now will be changed, introduced by my colleague from York Mills. That will give the people—and they've spoken loud and clear in my riding about that issue. These people want legislation passed to require persons convicted of sexual offences involving a child under the age of 14 to make a report to police upon release and to grant the public the power to disseminate this information in the register. I think that's a very important piece of legislation that should be pushed forward. I think, as we debate this motion to extend, most people would say that we are doing something worthwhile if we were debating that.

I had the opportunity in my past Solicitor General's critic position to spend some time down at police headquarters in Metro. I was down in the sexual assault unit and when I went in there, they have high technology where they show you a computer and they said to me, "Pick out a street," and I picked out a street in Metro Toronto, and they can pull up where there are known sex offenders in the city of Toronto. In a lot of cases they know that those people are going to be repeat offenders and it's just a case of sitting and waiting till they catch them. Most people out there are saying that we cannot afford any longer to have a justice system

which is failing the people of this province. So I would hope, as we debate this motion to extend the sittings, to look at bills like 114, which now I guess has been changed—that was the original one before we took time off—so that we can get some legislation in here that people will say is going to improve their standard of living and their quality of life. As I look at the notices in the order paper, there is nothing in there that's going to do that.

I'm interested in dealing with some of the other concerns. My friend from Leeds-Grenville was pleased that his anti-drug bill was passed in this Legislature in the private member's hour, even though I guess there were some members of the NDP, about 25 of them, who voted against it. This bill would provide two methods by which drug sellers could be kicked out of their rental units, and quite frankly, I can't see why anybody would object to that.

In my former critic's position I also had an opportunity to go out with the Halton undercover drug squad and the Metro police up in 31 Division, and I was astonished by the incidence of drug abuse and drug dealing. In one of the units we went up to, we pulled up in the police car and the sergeant said, "Watch this," and the people were dealing drugs and they waited till we came up and they were so blatant they wouldn't even go in the apartment till we got up very close. So I think most people would say that if we were dealing with some of the legislation like Mr Runciman's bill it would be worthwhile sitting. As I look at the Orders and Notices, there isn't anything that's going to deal with the drug problem here in this province.

Some of the other issues, which I guess are being addressed by the deputy ministers now, that I've had calls on, that aren't going to be dealt with are things like the situation with the people getting HIV because of tainted blood. Since almost my election I presented a petition which called on the government to share the responsibility with those haemophiliacs who have contracted AIDS through the contaminated blood. The system works very, very slowly. It's been two and a half years and I guess even as we speak they're in Ottawa dealing with this issue.

Some of the other provinces, the province of Nova Scotia and Quebec, have just recently agreed to compensate victims, but there's nothing in the province of Ontario. So it's been a very frustrating two and a half years. Some of the people have died and because of their disease some of them are unable to get insurance for their families. So there are some things that we do here that I think could affect people that are not happening, and quite frankly, when I look at what is going on with this Legislature, we aren't dealing with some of those real issues.

1750

The same with the chronic fatigue and immune



deficiency syndrome. I have some friends who asked me to introduce a petition on that. I've had some discussions with the minister, but there has been no action in that regard. Of course, for those who don't know, this is a chronic and debilitating disease currently affecting, I guess, about two million adults and children in North America. The diagnosis is difficult and the direct costs to our health care system are enormous because these people are flooding our beds in the entire health care system.

There's a drain on social services and the tax revenue is severely being affected because people cannot work. That question isn't being addressed. Had that come before the Legislature, and if we were debating some of those issues, I think people would say it's worthwhile debating around the clock and sitting longer, but quite frankly we're are not.

We need to establish a task force, I believe, on this problem of chronic fatigue and immune deficiency syndrome. That task force would be able to study the most appropriate methods of providing information and care to patients with the disease in their families. I say to the Minister of Health, we will be continuing to push on that particular vein.

There's a little girl in my riding, eight years old, similar in age to my family, who's affected with this disease. She has great difficulty coping with school, friends and physical activities, all things children of that age should be doing, and many of the teachers don't fully understand the problems that are being created and what is being created by this disease.

Since I have been here, we've been unable to effect any change in that area as well.

I'm interested in some of the other things we do here. As members will know, we had a committee on NAFTA. We didn't spend a great deal of time on things like chronic fatigue syndrome, but we spent a lot of time on NAFTA. We had a committee that went around and spent, I guess, about \$300,000. I kiddingly called it a day care for second-rate cabinet ministers.

I hope some of the cabinet ministers won't be offended, but quite frankly when I look and see all the problems we have here, and none of the important issues getting debated, none of the reported bills brought forward that are going to protect people in this province—to watch what went on with that particular committee, which was nothing more than a political sham of spending about \$300,000 at a time when we're laying off nurses and doctors and teachers.

The Premier already said what their position is: They're opposed to NAFTA. On the one hand, he says, as he said today, he wants to open up trade to the United States and we have provincial trade barriers that aren't being attacked by this government, something it can do something about.

When I look and see the limited resources we have for legislative committees and the limited resources and debating time here, having spent \$300,000 to go around the province and debate something where the Premier had already told us beforehand, quite frankly, was a complete waste.

I would like to get a great deal of debate on the budget in here. I think that's become the most important issue and I'll get into some more of the details later, but if we were extending the sittings to take a look at that budget—one of the things that continually amaze me is how long we spend debating bills previously put before this Legislature. We're still just getting past the previous budget and I guess people wonder why we're a little cynical when we see the debates on bills where supposedly in this House the debaters try to change the government's position. In most cases, the taxes are not only being collected; they've been spent and spent again by the time we get around to debating it.

If we were looking at the budget bills that I think all members would like to have a debate on, then I think most people would be saying we are doing something that is constructive and helpful. We are not and I say to the House leader, who's not here, that I hope at some point in time, as part of the extended sittings, we will all get a chance to take a look at the budget because there is a tremendous amount of fear and anxiety out there with what's happening with the tax increases and with the spending. As a part of all this, I hope we will get an opportunity to do that.

I will support any motion that will allow us to stay longer, if in fact we are going to get a chance. As we all know, we're being—I don't want to use the word "blackmailed" because that probably wouldn't be appropriate, but we are being—I don't even know the words to describe it—encouraged that if we cut off debate in other areas we can have our budget debate.

Unfortunately, there are so many areas so critical to this problem. There are so many problems. There are many of us who were elected last time who believe that if we really truly give you some good input, we may improve some of the bills. Number one, I don't believe a lot of the bills that we are talking about here are relevant, are going to really affect the average person who's feeling cynical, discouraged and left out, but number two, I'm also concerned that our voice isn't being heard.

I'm concerned we aren't dealing with some of the issues. I've had a great deal of calls and concerns over day care and home care workers who are being driven out of business, over the private sector day care workers. A lot of people believe that in this province if you do something for a profit it's a crime. Quite frankly, the ironic thing is that whether it's non-profit housing or day care, in most cases the private sector is able to do the job faster, better, cheaper and at no

expense to the taxpayers.

One of the disconcerting things to us is that some of the pieces of legislation that is so important, like the legislation which basically, for want of a better word, is driving the private sector out of day care, was done with no debate in here. As we all know, the people were on the front lawns of the Legislature, yelling and screaming about that particular piece of legislation. We never had an opportunity in here to discuss it, to debate it and to deal with it because it was done outside.

I believe those people are suffering, and their families, and most of them are working women. I believe they can contribute and they're being pushed out without any debate in here, and that's one of the frustrating parts that I've got with our whole system.

I'm also concerned about the anti-business climate here in Ontario. I took our critic's position as the critic for Industry, Trade and Technology and now the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade for two reasons: one, because of my background in business, and two, because I believed it used be a sort of good-time ministry where you got a chance to go around and meet people and discuss issues.

I enjoy talking about the issues that are out there—a big reader of management and the different management practices—but I have never been so discouraged as going out and meeting with the chambers of commerce and businesses, with the feeling that is out there right now on what's happening in this province.

I think it's even worse than average people realize. The discouraged people out there are saying, if they were to look at these Orders and Notices, and small businesses are saying, "If you extend the sittings and you're going to be here, what are you going to produce?" Most of the things we're going to produce will inhibit business in this province. I honestly, truly believe that with a lot of the initiatives, if we did nothing, if we took the next two years off till the next election, it would be better for the province. I'm discouraged that there isn't legislation that's going to help, and I'm discouraged about some of the legislation that's going to hurt.

There's a tremendous feeling of anxiety out there among our youth who are now looking for jobs, even as we speak. Many people are finding it a difficult time to find a job. They're trying to be able to compete, to be able to afford their education. Their fees are going up dramatically, and yet they're finding a difficult time finding a job.

At the same time, we're saying to people that the only way to get jobs long term is to have an education, and I'll speak on education in a little more detail in a minute, because I see the education role, and I know the minister is here. We have many concerns, so many problems, and essentially what this government has

done is said, "We'll put it off to the now famous royal commission and it'll report by the time the next election rolls around." A lot of people are saying we need help now.

There are many areas and many concerns in housing. We have a situation where waiting lists are now getting longer in non-profit housing and yet there are no initiatives. The only good thing about extending the sittings, as part of this motion, is that we're going to be able to continually hammer the Minister of Housing on that issue.

I have, looking in front of me here now, the auditor's report, which looked at non-profit housing. It has to be one of the most overwhelming condemnations of non-profit housing ever given. I highlighted some of the points and I want to read a couple of the points out here because I guess one of the good things about this motion is that we'll get an opportunity to continue to stay on the Minister of Housing on this very important issue.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Probably another month.

**Mr Carr:** Probably another month, the member says.

The total capital cost of the 46,000 provincial units is projected to be \$5 billion. Annual operating subsidies will work out to be well over \$1 billion. I think I should say that this is not me speaking; it's the auditor in his report. The annual report says that the subsidies will approach \$1 billion by 1995, when all 81,600 units are to be completed and operating. In addition, the most recent budget announced a further 20,000 units, at an estimated annual operating subsidy of \$200 million upon completion.

**1800**

I want to read the very critical part of what they said, because of course none of this came through in any bills, any legislation. If we were here to be able to stand up to the minister and debate a bill on this, it would be one thing, but none of this came through any bills. It was simply done by a government that initiated it. I want to read parts of that report.

It said, "The review and approval of over 70,000 assisted housing units in five years was a significant and costly undertaking." That, I think, is a bit of an understatement. "The task was made even more costly by pressures to meet inflexible annual deadlines." The sad part about that is the inflexible deadlines were set by politicians who were screaming as a result of political pressure; not doing what's right, not doing what is in the best interests of, first of all, the people on the waiting lists, or the taxpayers, but they were driven by political deadlines.

This is very important. At a time when we're talking about laying off nurses, doctors, teachers, rolling back



salaries, I want to read something very important. It says, "Consequently, the controls in place to ensure projects were built only where needed and at a competitive cost were less than satisfactory."

I want to read that again: "Consequently, the controls in place to ensure projects were built only where needed and at a competitive cost were less than satisfactory."

Basically what that says—and it's not me saying it; it's the auditor—is there are no controls in place. They're rubber-stamping them. The maximum unit price, which was supposed to be the maximum unit price, became the average unit price, and the payment to the taxpayer is, quite frankly, going to be outrageous.

"Need and demand studies were not thorough, so a number of projects were allotted to communities with high vacancy rates and little demand for market rent units. Filling vacant market rent units with rent-geared-to-income tenants raised future subsidies over projections and may have jeopardized the program's income integration objectives." That's what the auditor is saying about this housing program that is costing us not millions but billions.

"Despite a significant decline in land prices," and we all know that in the province of Ontario there's been a significant decline in prices and construction costs after 1989, "the costs of projects approved for going ahead between 1990-91 continue to increase, particularly in the central region." That's very important, because when I talk to the people at Halton non-profit housing about this report, they say, "Yes, that's bad, and there are many problems, but not in our area." All the non-profit housing in this province say it's all somebody else's fault. They're doing okay; it's all somebody else's fault.

They go on to say, "In the absence of competitive procurement practices, the allowable maximum unit price became a target for developers rather than a ceiling, adding to development costs." It's ironic that this government spent, I think, the—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Carr:** "I love Guelph." Yes, we all do, particularly during the hockey season when we go up there to play them. For the folks back home who are wondering what is happening, the member for Guelph just walked by with a bag that said, "I love Guelph," and we all do. I'll be up there again, probably, next winter with the hockey team.

So what happened is, this government, in the last little while, spent a great deal of time dealing with developers under the previous government and saying it was a terrible piece of work, what was happening with developers, and yet their own auditor's report is overwhelmingly condemning this government and its non-profit housing.

It says, "The ministry controls were less than satisfactory to ensure the completed non-profit housing projects

were managed in a cost-effective manner and were in compliance with the program's objectives and guidelines." That's very serious. When you read it, basically they're saying the housing projects were not managed in a cost-effective manner and were not in compliance with the program's objectives and guidelines. This is coming from an auditor who looked at it and said, "We are doing a terrible job in terms of the actual operations."

Most of these non-profit housing units were started by the previous government, but I think even now, because of the continual pressure we put on this government, even the Liberals now admit that the program has been a failure. I think yesterday, and I don't want to put words in her mouth, the leader of the Liberal Party in fact even said that she's not in favour of non-profit housing in the province of Ontario until they get some of the controls in place. She may mean long-term. I don't want to put words in her mouth, but she said we should take a look at it, and I fully concur. We've been seeing this for two years. At a time when we're in a financial crisis, we need to take a look at it.

"Over 25% of the projects we reviewed lacked approved operating budgets, either because budgets and audited financial statement information had been filed late or because the ministry had not yet reviewed them. Several still had not been filed."

Here we are at a time when we say resources are scarce, we're laying off nurses, doctors, teachers, rolling back salaries, in a real financial crisis, and they're saying that the ministry hasn't even filed some of the controls that should be put in place. Over 25% of the projects lack the approved operating budgets. That's a very serious allegation in these tough economic times.

"Multiple waiting lists and inconsistent placement criteria and referral practices make it unlikely that those in need of affordable housing will be treated consistently, equitably and efficiently."

Again, that's the auditor speaking. I want to just briefly read that again.

"However, multiple waiting lists and inconsistent placement criteria and referral practices make it unlikely that those in need of affordable housing will be treated consistently, equitably and efficiently."

What that means is we're spending two, three and a half times what the private sector could to build this non-profit housing. It wouldn't be so bad if we were actually helping those in need. For those who want to take a look at it, because I know the members have the auditor's report, it's on page 126 of the auditor's report. Basically, they're saying the people in need aren't being serviced, and that's the worst part about this whole thing. The ones who need it, the ones who are on waiting lists, are not being serviced.

Rent supplements cost significantly less in govern-

ment subsidies and address the affordability problems. They said that we should take a look at some of the rental subsidies. On page 127:

"In total, the average monthly carrying cost per rental unit is substantially greater than the rent received from both market rent and rent-geared-to-income tenants, resulting in an average annual subsidy per unit of about \$12,500."

That works out to be \$15,000 in Metro Toronto. By 1995, with over 81,000 units, the subsidies will approach \$1 billion, and this doesn't include the cost of Ontario Housing operations, which totalled about \$500 million in 1991.

It goes on to say that one result of the pressures on the ministry staff is that the needs analyses were not done. They basically put in place rental units, non-profit housing units, where there was a group that was prepared to do it, rather than looking at where there were waiting lists. Again, and I won't belabour the point, but this isn't me saying this, this is the auditor. An independent, objective look at non-profit housing.

It goes on to say:

"In fact, since 1988, the ministry did not require any need and demand studies for projects in communities with vacancy rates below 1%.

"Consequently, project selection often depended more on other selection criteria such as the availability of suitable land and the readiness of the sponsoring group to proceed."

What this means is that we are not building non-profit housing based on where the need is; we're building it based on what's easiest for the Ministry of Housing and for the consultants who are pushing it through.

"This was particularly evident in Metropolitan Toronto where, according to a ministry study, an 800-square-foot, two-bedroom apartment that cost \$156,000 in 1989 could be built for less than \$106,000 in 1991, including a 20% profit for the developer."

In other words, to say the least, we were blowing a tremendous amount of money in the province of Ontario; this at a time when we're facing many, many economic crises.

1810

I will just refer the members to the New Zealand report that was on W5. I have a copy of what was in that report. At a time when we have resource allocations, for us to be continuing with non-profit housing I think is a disgrace. I want to talk a little about what happened in New Zealand, because the same thing may potentially happen here. They basically reached a point where they couldn't borrow any more. I want to read a bit of that text, because at a time when we've got the auditor saying we are wasting money, I want to tell you the deep financial crisis we were in.

As to this motion to extend the sittings, I think most people would say, "If you're going to deal with these pressing problems, yes, maybe we should be going around the clock all summer." All members would be prepared to do that if they were actually contributing to the betterment of this province. They are not.

I want to read something out of that report. This is Eric Malling talking:

"Economists are predicting that some time in the next two years"—he's talking about Canada—"the Deputy Minister of Finance is going to walk into the cabinet, it doesn't matter whose cabinet, and announce that Canada's credit has run out. Now, in all that matters, our lives will change. Scaremongering? Well, Canada now has more foreign debt than any other developed country." We're getting down there with Mexico, Brazil, and their credit rating ran out just like ours.

It got so bad in New Zealand, in their particular case, that they couldn't even afford to keep the animals in the zoo. They actually, in the famous case that was shown on the TV show, had to shoot the baby hippo that was born because they couldn't afford to keep it.

I think it's important to remember that the Prime Minister of the day wasn't a Conservative Prime Minister, he was a Labour Prime Minister. I want to have the members opposite visualize this. They had a tradition of spending a great deal of money, and what happened is that a chap by the name of Richard Prebble, who was the assistant Finance minister—I will read a brief excerpt: In came the Secretary of the Treasury and the governor of the Reserve Bank, and you start by saying, "Well, why have you stopped all foreign exchange dealings?" and they say, "Very simple, Minister. We have no foreign exchange," and the man says, "What?" That's exactly what happened. They were unable to borrow. The lenders were spooked and firms like, it says here, Merrill Lynch and the Salomon Brothers, reported that New Zealand bonds weren't selling; as simple as that.

That's why this whole question of what we are doing for our finances is so important, because apparently it was that TV show that spooked the Premier. But when you see it compared to what we are doing in Ontario, there is very grave concern out there. Basically, because they could no longer borrow, they called their embassies around the world and said: "Can you go to the banks in Canada, the Royal Banks and the CIBCs and so on, and attempt to borrow money on behalf of the government? Use your line of credit and send it back, because we're broke and the cheques are about to bounce."

The scary part is that they go on to say New Zealand's foreign debt was 40% of the gross national product. Canada's foreign debt today is about 44% of our gross domestic product, almost as bad; it's money from the rest of the world that we borrowed to keep up our standard of living. The total government debt of



62% of the gross national product pushed New Zealand over the edge, and that's why we are in the situation we are in today.

I'm going to talk a little about the finances in a moment, but I want to get back to the non-profit housing, because at a time when we're facing probably the most severe financial crisis in this province and indeed this country in many areas, we've got this notice of motion to debate. We don't have anything in there that's going to deal with the fundamental problems. We are having very little debate on how we're going to get out of non-profit housing, how we're going to get back to some fiscal responsibility.

I think most people would say that if we are going to continue down the road and be spending our time, we should at least be spending it wisely on things that are important; we are not. There is nothing in here that is going to deal with the fiscal crisis, unless we do get a chance to debate the budget, if the government honours us with the opportunity to debate the budget, which I see as a fundamental right and one of the things I was elected to do. Most of the things that people care about, the debt and the taxation issue, will not be dealt with.

I want to be very clear, and make no mistake about it: Ontario is in trouble. Our economy now is being battered by high taxation, high government spending, high unemployment and low productivity. Our social costs are soaring because of the soaring costs for health, education. Some of the issues of crime and poverty seem to be growing faster than we can respond to them. The problem, and I say this in a non-partisan way, is that we're overtaxing, we're overspending, we're overgoverning, we're overregulating, we're overlegislating, and this motion to extend doesn't talk about any of those things. There isn't one bill in here that's going to deal with any of those fundamental problems of overtaxation, overregulating, the overlegislating. As a matter of fact, I think, if anything, some of the legislation is going to increase it.

I sit here as a practical person asking: What should we be doing? How are we going to properly analyse the situation? How are we going to take corrective action? How can we implement solutions? How are we going to be able to sustain them? The problem is that in this notice of motion, the bills we are dealing with are not going to address any of the problems that are facing this province.

To put it in perspective, our taxation now is driving businesses out. Since 1985, people will know we've had three elections. We've now had three Premiers, four governments, and we're up to over 60 tax increases in the province of Ontario. Going way back to 1985, we had about a 10% tax advantage over Quebec and rated very competitive versus West Germany and Japan. Today we are one of the highest-taxed jurisdictions in all of North America. I met with some German bankers

a while ago who said, "We have plenty of customers all over the world coming to take a look at moving into Ontario," but they take a look at the competitive tax structure, see a 20% tax disadvantage for Ontario versus Ohio and some of the surrounding states, and say, "Why would we put a plant or a facility or a manufacturing operation somewhere where our taxation is out of control and extremely high?"

This isn't just me saying this. I want to read a comment from Pat Palmer, who came before the finance and economic affairs committee. He's the president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. He said, which I think summed it up better than anybody else:

"Never in the past half-century have business conditions in Ontario been as bad: record numbers of bankruptcies, chilling numbers of plant closures and layoffs.

"See our blood? No more taxes. Tax increases will only make the deficit position worse and subsequently put even more pressures on our social programs."

We spent about three weeks hearing from the people right across this province. Liz Barkley was in, OSSTF, Sid Ryan, all the unions were in, the business community was in, talking about our problems. One of the things they said we should not be doing is increasing taxes, and I think Mr Palmer said it better than anybody else during those hearings.

Yet what happened in this last budget, a budget which I hope is a part of the motion to extend the sittings so we'll be allowed to debate it? They imposed \$2 billion in new tax increases.

The problem is that it isn't just the tax on corporations. I know the other side says, "We didn't increase the corporations tax." They said in opposition, as all NDP governments do, that they'd tax the rich and tax corporations. But as they found out when they got in, as you can see when you read the budget, the simple fact is that we only get 7% of our revenue from corporation taxes; you can increase them all you want, but you're not going to get any more revenue. But the problem is that when you increase taxes by \$2 billion, as they did in the last budget, that takes it out of the hands of consumers, people who are afraid for their jobs right now, afraid of overtaxation or afraid to spend money; \$2 billion more is going to scare them off even more at a time when we need more jobs.

We were very critical of that. I believe we need a government able to create a business and economic environment that will create jobs, and to do that we need to cut spending, we need to reduce the deficit and we need to cut taxes. As part of that solution, I prepared, along with my colleague the member for Carleton, who is our critic of Finance, about a 30-page report of some of the things we would like to see done. As we debate this motion to extend, I think that if we were here today debating some of the fundamental

issues that are in here, people would feel that at least we're accomplishing something in getting the government on an agenda that's going to affect them. The number one issue is the economy, yet when you look at the bills that we're going to be debating with these extended sittings, there isn't anything in here that is going to improve people's standard of living or quality of life quickly.

Long-term they will, and I'll get into some of the OTAB debate—that's a piece of legislation in the long term—and I think education's very important. I spent a great deal of time, a lot of nights, putting together some of my conclusions about what should be done. I put 15 of my recommendations together.

1820

If we were debating bills dealing with some of these issues, most people out there would say: "Yes, we've got some constructive pieces of work before the Legislature, and it's going to affect me. Stay there, debate the bills, pass the bills, amend the bills, get them out to committee if you have to." But as I look at what's on the order paper and the bills this government wants, there isn't anything there that's going to improve their economic life.

I've put together some of the things I would like to see. First of all, I called for no tax increases, because I honestly, truly believe that the economy is fragile now. If we do increase taxes, we're only going to scare more people. This was tabled with the Premier and the Minister of Finance; they didn't listen. I don't think most people even realize how hard they're going to get hit until the middle of July when they open up that cheque and, boy, they're going to really know with the massive tax increases, and it's going to further scare off people who would be producing jobs. Whether it's buying a new fridge or stove or the kids a new pair of shoes, they're going to be scared off. There is very little economic activity and consumer spending because the tax increases are driving people away from spending.

In my report, I did call for the commercial concentration tax to be repealed. That was successful, so I tip my hat to the government, because that was penalizing businesses in Metro Toronto.

To prevent the flight of capital from Ontario, to maintain a positive investment environment and to encourage a return to profitability, I believe the government should have included in its 1993 budget a clear and definite statement that it will not, during its term of office, impose a wealth or estate tax or a corporate minimum tax. Even though they said, "We're going to tax the rich and we're going to tax corporations," the fact is that the bulk of our revenue in terms of taxes comes from the middle class. That's why they increased the massive surtax on the middle class, not because all of a sudden as socialists they believe the middle class should be taxed, but because that's the only area where

they can get revenue. At the high end of the scale, if you increase the taxes on some of the rich people, they just move their term deposits to Japan or the United States; we lose the investment and there's no way of getting that revenue back.

It was going way back to February that I said we need to cut back on spending. I said we should freeze the budget at the 1992 level for this year. We should integrate a multi-year program, a spending freeze with the objective of balancing the operating account in three years, because I support the initiatives of cutting back. The government's too big, too large and it's grown too often.

As part of the strategy, the province should adopt a balanced-budget law, which would require a government to balance the budget at least once during its term of office. The scary part is that when this government came in, the first \$10-billion deficit was considered to be such an outrage, and now it's ingrained. It's going to be \$10 billion: We're struggling, fighting, talking about rolling back salaries, talking about laying off teachers, nurses, and that's only to keep the deficit to \$10 billion.

I talked about the reduction in the civil service. I have been saying this since the 1990 election. I believe we could get back to the 1985 levels. It should be done through attrition, because what happens with immediate cuts is that departments one day have 20 people and all of a sudden have 15. The way I would like to see it done is to reduce the number of civil servants through attrition, so that if somebody is leaving, as they will over the next little while, they would have time to plan for those reductions, to get more efficient.

Anybody who believes it can't be done in the public sector is foolish, because it can. I've seen that in my own area in automotive, because Oakville has the Ford plant. They are now producing in Ontario—not just Ford but all of the auto makers—more cars with fewer people. We are more efficient—

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe, with this very important issue that's being debated, the government is maintaining a quorum.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please check if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Oakville South.

**Mr Carr:** I guess some of the members have just slipped out to grab a bite to eat and are certainly going to come back. They're probably watching on the TV, anyway.

I believe we can get back to 1985 levels very easily. I've talked a great deal about social assistance reform,



because we will never, ever be able to tackle the problem of the deficit unless we deal with the incidence of social assistance, because we're now spending about \$6.2 billion on social assistance; that's \$6.2 billion, "b" as in "billion." We used to spend, in 1990, about \$2 billion, so it's tripled since this government was elected, and there will never be any opportunity to control the deficit or control spending until we get a handle on social assistance.

So as part of my recommendations I put some things that I think should be done. I believe we should act on a lot of the things that were in the SARC report. That's the frustrating part about this. For so many of these issues you don't need to go out and invent new solutions; they're out there. The SARC report, which spent time and money going across this province, had many solutions we could implement that we are not. Some of it's the fault of governments changing and one government comes in and—

**Mr Callahan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm really amazed that within a minute of the government being required to have a quorum in here, there is no longer a quorum.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please verify if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Oakville South, you have the floor.

**Mr Carr:** We may have a few members having to whip in with indigestion. I understand they're having a little chicken, and they have to keep running in for the quorum calls; that's unfortunate. I hope they won't get sick. I think there's a little bit of chicken on your tie.

Anyway, getting back to the serious problem of the SARC report, here we are debating the motion to extend the sittings to look at some of the major problems, yet the SARC report dealt with this issue and hasn't been implemented, and most people out there I think would feel a lot better had some of those been implemented.

I say to the Minister of Community and Social Services that there are some things we should do:

We could link social assistance to using welfare dollars for wage subsidies to employers hiring social assistance recipients. I think that would be helpful.

We need to determine why, in outstanding welfare repayments, the recovery rate—again, it is the auditor saying so—is only 3% versus 10% recovery rate reported for the collection of the other government. All this was summarized in our recommendations on the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, but it was in more detail in the report that was done for the standing committee on public accounts from the member for Burlington South, who goes into a great detail.

I know the Minister of Community and Social Services will have read that report.

We're talking about a system to take a look at the income replacement scheme with the federal government to recover interim welfare moneys from those waiting to collect unemployment insurance. The auditor says we could probably save \$50 million there.

I believe we should adopt a law similar to Quebec's to beef up the authority of the welfare review officers to conduct welfare fraud inquiries. In Quebec they have about a 75% success rate. I have a newspaper clipping from my own area which says, "Fraud Buster Saves Halton \$72,000." He was a welfare investigator. That's \$72,000 only for one area in Halton, because they only put 20% of it in. He has saved the Halton region about \$485,000, getting close to half a million dollars, and it says here that 17 charges that were laid.

**1830**

I believe we should do what was done in Quebec: adopt a law similar to theirs which would beef up the authority of welfare review officers to conduct welfare fraud inquiries. In Quebec, officials have said they have a 75% success rate in recovering welfare fraud in the 5,000 cases they've looked at. I gave you the example of my own Halton region, where we have saved \$485,000 by one individual checking for fraud and waste.

At a time when we're scaling back the public service, laying off nurses and teachers, cutting back their salaries, whatever comes about through the social contract, we need to take a look at where the money is going. We need to have confidence that money isn't being wasted in the area of social assistance.

We said, as we did when it first came in, that you shouldn't get rid of the home visits as a means of determining eligibility. They used to go out and take a look at homes and assess the eligibility requirements, but they don't do that now. We said you shouldn't extend it to 16- and 17-year-old students who simply declare that they are no longer comfortable living at home and get social assistance. The ironic part is that 30% of the people on social assistance can't work, through no fault of their own, whether it's disability or whatever, and they don't have the amount of money they need to survive. But 70% can work. We need to have the means to get them off social assistance so we have money to provide for the truly needy, because there will never be enough money if we continue to go from \$2 billion to \$6.2 billion. To put it in perspective, it's now one in nine people in this province. That's an outrageous figure, but it's true: One in nine people are now on some form of social assistance in the province of Ontario.

I also said in that report that we should consider establishing a summer employment program to increase staff available to conduct eligibility reviews and to help

reduce seasonal welfare fraud. It does heat up over the summer, some of the fraud and abuse, because of the number of people coming into it. It can be stopped, and at a time when we're looking at savings, we need to do that.

We should ensure that any proposed changes to social assistance eligibility requirements are properly and fully implemented.

Those were some of the things we said, and that's just a very small portion of our minority report that we put together for the public accounts committee.

We said you should impose a moratorium on the non-profit housing program and complete only those projects currently under way. Instead of subsidizing bricks and mortar, the government should revamp its housing policy to help individuals and families meet their housing needs through direct shelter allowances. It has been estimated that you could provide housing for 250,000 people at a cost of about \$400 million annually versus what we're doing now, providing 100,000 non-profit units at a cost of \$1.2 billion. We will continue to work on that.

In this report, we said the government should establish a program on the expenditure side similar to the Fair Tax Commission. It could be done with no expense, through volunteers. See, in this province, we don't look at how we're going to control spending. We think, how are we going to find new ways to increase taxes? That's what the Fair Tax Commission is all about. Quite frankly, it was set up because the government said when it came in, "All the money in the world for all the programs." They were going to tax the rich and the corporations, but when they got in, they found out that only 7% of our revenue came from there and they couldn't increase it on the rich people because there wasn't enough to get any revenue. So they lowered it and put surtaxes on anybody making \$53,000. Most people making \$53,000 didn't realize that they were "the rich" this government meant.

So we said we should set up a program similar to the Fair Tax Commission. A further recommendation of a couple of people who came in was an effective expenditure commission. It would be made up of individuals from outside government and be structured like the Fair Tax Commission to look at different issues. The commission would be given a mandate to examine the ways in which public funds are spent in Ontario and to recommend ways to save money as well as the associated cost, if any, to the quality of the services provided.

The commission would create a number of working groups to focus on specific categories of expenditures for a fixed period of time, similar to what the Fair Tax Commission does. People would have confidence if we had them review social assistance or non-profit housing. The commission should be responsible for the development of a new government value assessment process

which would evaluate programs on the basis of how well they work as opposed to how they sell politically.

I said that any new tax or regulatory policy affecting business should be subject to assessment of its effect on competitiveness. As we found out and as this government has found out, all of the things we are care about, whether good roads, the health care system, the education system, don't depend upon the compassion of government; they depend on having a healthy and prosperous economy to support them. There's one fundamental principle that I think is clearer now than it has ever been: If we can't compete, we're going to lose markets, and when we lose markets, people are going to end up losing jobs.

In that report I put together, I said any new proposed tax policy or regulations affecting business be subject to an assessment of its effect on the competitiveness of Ontario firms, on the cost of doing business in the province, and its impact on employment. The assessment mechanism and the process should be developed in consultation with the affected sectors.

I also said we would repeal Bill 40.

We talked about the WCB in some detail. We went further: The member for Waterloo North had a resolution in this House a couple of weeks ago in which we laid out some of our ideas. It failed, but at least we were offering some constructive solutions in that area.

We talked about the small business sector being exempt from the employer health payroll tax. That is a job-killing tax. When some of the bills came forward and this government was spending about \$250 million to help small business, it said, small businesses said, "If you're going to spend \$250 million, it would be better to eliminate the employer health tax." It should be phased out: Take whatever amount of businesses would be affected, starting with the smallest first. Eliminate the employer health payroll tax rather than spending \$250 million in the so-called capital investment fund they put together, supposedly to help small business.

We also talk about the accounting system. We've gone into great detail about where some of the problems are in our accounting system in this province.

But regardless of how we add up the numbers, our deficit position, as I outlined, is horrendous. I want to very briefly talk about some of the figures and facts, because this motion to extend will not deal with any of these issues.

In this motion, if we were doing bills to deal with fundamental problems of the deficit—I guess in some regards Bill 48 will, but that probably will be passed in short order. I suspect there will probably be some agreement signed anyway. But if we were dealing with something to eliminate the deficit, most people would say it would be a great idea to extend the sittings. None of the things we're going to be talking about as a result



of this motion will deal with the deficit and the problems of job creation and taxation. I think that, more than anything else, is a shame.

I want to tell you what the accumulated deficit is now. It's about \$80 billion. In 1985 it was about \$35 billion. We've heard the Premier say it was heading towards \$120 billion if they didn't take some of the expenditure control measures that were announced April 23.

To put that in perspective, at \$80 billion of accumulated deficit—if we do succeed in keeping it to \$10 billion this year, which is a big, big if—that will work out to \$8,000 for every man, woman and child in this province. When you look around, the members in here provincially owe \$8,000. That doesn't include federally, which is about \$15,000, by the way. When you add the two together, the debt that's owed by every man, woman and child in this province, federally and provincially, is well over \$23,000. In my case, married with three kids, that's about \$115,000. That's more than most people's mortgages, and that is in terms of deficits owed to the governments.

1840

Somebody said to me, "Well, I didn't create that." No, you didn't, but you owe it, because we all owe it together. I might add that it doesn't include the \$13 billion in unfunded liability that's in WCB, which is going up \$100 million a month and discouraging investment. That doesn't include the \$35 billion at Ontario Hydro. If you include all those things in, it gets even worse. Interest payments alone now are going to be costing this province about \$15,000 a minute. That isn't to pay for good roads or the health care system. When you break it down, that's what it costs: \$15,000 a minute just to pay the interest on the provincial deficit. Just like the clock on the wall that's keeping track of the time, that clock keeps ticking 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, and it keeps adding up and adding up.

So the only solution is to cut spending. There are some areas in which I think we should be doing it. When you look back over the last little while and see where we've come from, if we were spending at 1983 levels adjusted for inflation, we should be spending this year about \$39 billion, because in the early 1980s, we were at about \$25 billion. In 10 years, we have spent double, triple the rate of inflation during a lot of those years, and we were ending up with a total spending of about \$55 billion; that's where we were heading. In other words, we're spending more and more money, yet in this province we've got more people on welfare. Our hospitals have longer waiting lists, to the point now where there's a company that will sell you waiting list insurance. There's a waiting list now for hips, knees, various medical procedures. So we're spending all this money, and things get worse.

The same with the education system. We're now spending probably more per capita than any other industrialized country, yet 25% of the kids in high school are dropping out; it's probably closer to 27%. Of those who are graduating, 25% are either functionally illiterate or can't do basic math skills; a third of them lack an acceptable level of literacy skills. Some of the tests that have been done in universities over the last little while said first-year students don't have a lot of the skills necessary.

I was out with my friend the member for Oxford at the opening of a training centre in my riding: sophisticated, with all the high-tech machines. We realized we've got to prepare for the future. We've got all these machines in place. The people who are teaching said the problem is that these machines are so high-tech, they need computer skills that the kids coming out of high school don't have. So here we are spending all this money on high-tech equipment, but the kids coming out of high school don't have the skills that are necessary to get the advanced training.

I think we all realize that we must provide excellence in our education system, but none of the bills we're dealing with is going to fundamentally change the education system. This government's answer was to set up a commission, so we'll have a commission going around and debating the issue.

We put together a little while ago A Blueprint for Learning in Ontario. Rather than waiting for the government, we attempted to be proactive. We put together some of the things we would like to see and, similar to my minority report, we put in it the things we believe are necessary. We talk about some of the things that need to be done to make our education and training systems accountable to the people they serve, both financially and in terms of curriculum and standards. Accountability will give us the financial resources to provide excellence in education, and excellence will open up the doors of opportunity for our children. I firmly believe the standard of living of the next generation will be in direct proportion to the skills and training we give them through the education system. That's why we put it together, to be proactive, yet the things we're talking about in this Legislature won't do anything to improve the education system.

We have three principles that we put together: opportunity, excellence and accountability. That was the core of our education system in the blueprint. By outlining the proposals in a document, we wanted to let everyone know where we stood, rather than being like a lot of our opposition politicians in the past, who just complained.

We put together the first New Directions series on the economy. Had some of the things we talked about been implemented, we wouldn't be in the situation we're in today in the province of Ontario.

That being said, we put together our new minority report on some of the ideas; you didn't like the first one. We talked about some of the wage caps we were going to put on, going way back to November 1991; had that been done, we would not be facing the financial crisis we're in today.

We put together some other ideas in our New Directions, our Blueprint for Learning in Ontario. More than anything else, what we hope to do is to stimulate some widespread exchange of ideas. Hopefully, some of these things will be implemented. I guess they'll go to the commission.

The frustrating part is that this government was elected, we've got major problems in the education system and nothing will be done for at least two years. So I say to the members opposite, if they take a look at that, we believe the skills and the knowledge training will be the key to the prosperity in Ontario. Rather than sitting back and criticizing and saying, "We disagree with this program," we decided to be proactive and put it together, because education, I believe, is really planning for the future, and the things we do in this Legislature and some of the issues we tackle will be fundamental.

We said that if some of the things are implemented, they will give our education system clear goals and measurable results. That's one of the things we want to be very clear about. In this Legislature, one of the things I've been frustrated at, as somebody who has a background in business, is that they never put anything in place that's measurable; it's all this fuzzy, nice warm talk. No one wants to have any standards that can be measurable because, quite frankly, I think a lot of politicians are afraid that the results won't be there. So we've put some standards in place, some goals that are measurable, because I believe our schools must not only teach children the basic skills such as reading and writing and arithmetic but also some of the other things that are necessary over the next little while as we compete in the next century.

Schools are going to face more pressure as a result of what's happening in the social contract talks, so we've offered some ideas to make it more efficient. We think if those ideas were implemented we'd be in a much better position in the province. I want to share some of the ideas, none of which are being addressed with the motion here, because there are no bills that will address these problems. But we've laid them out anyway in hopes that they will be acted upon by the government.

We talk about developing a core curriculum for elementary and secondary schools; we talked about this long before the government implemented anything. We talk about establishing testing at regular intervals to ensure an attainment of those standards, one of the things I think we might get this government to move on. We talk about combining grades on report cards, along

with the current descriptive information. We talk about expanding the apprenticeship program at the secondary school level to facilitate the school-to-work transition. We talk about increasing the number of instructional days; I think that needs to be done. We're talking about giving teachers, parents, business and labour more input into educational decisions through the school-based management system. We go into some detail about how that would be done; these are just the major highlights.

We talk about elimination of some of some of the duplication of the school board systems in this province. We talk about the mandate for regular external financial audits of all school boards, colleges and universities and to make those results public. We would establish and implement guidelines and policies for dealing with violence in schools at the board level. One of the things I'm amazed about as a parent is that with the procedures in place now for dealing with violence in school, you pretty much have to go up to the board before any real tough discipline takes place. Consequently, I don't believe there is a heck of a lot of discipline, and that's affecting our schooling in the province of Ontario.

We talk about introducing an income-contingent loan program for post-secondary education; we go into detail of how that would operate. We talk about the establishment of centres of specialization at our colleges and universities; again, there's a great deal of detail of how that would be done. We talk about establishing a training bank that will allow individuals to contribute to a maximum of \$3,000 annually for future investment in training and education programs and encouraging employers to match those programs. If we don't, I believe skills and training will be lacking. We talk about increasing the effectiveness of the apprenticeship system through streamlining, and increasing the cooperation between business, labour and schools.

#### 1850

So this document we put together was an attempt to take a look at where we're at in terms of education, because our schools are facing a tremendous problem and we have a lot of homework to do. But as we debate this motion, there won't be anything in here that will deal with those issues.

I want to talk briefly about the budget. The opportunity to speak in this Legislature on the budget is something that I think is fundamental. I believe, contrary to what the House leader says, that we should not be forced to give in on other pieces of legislation, so I'm prepared to sit and stay here as long as possible so that the other members who were not able to speak on this will get an opportunity, because as we went out on the time off, when we had constituency week and met with people right across this province, they were saying that we are in one heck of a financial predicament and they don't believe this government has the right ideas and policies to be able to solve those problems.



When you look at the spending that has gone on over the last little while, the tax increases—and this isn't me speaking; this is the Treasurer's budget. At the 1984 level, we were spending about \$23 billion. We're now skyrocketing up into the 50s. Our operating deficit is going up. People are fearful, and they don't believe this government has the skills and the ability to deal with that question. On economic matters, there will be no bills we're going to be debating.

They talked about issues of crime. According to some of the findings, 85% of Ontarians, including 88% of all women and 69% of visible minorities, believe that crime has increased in Ontario. When asked whether crime in their own neighbourhood has increased over the last two years, 63% said yes. On the other hand, 73% believed that respect for the law has decreased. Those attitudes were even more prevalent in Metro Toronto. As a result of some of our hearings on crime and safety in our communities, Ontarians feels laws are too lenient, that enforcement should be stringent and punishment should be tougher. None of that will be debated here.

I'm looking now at a list of the issues I've been asked to address in terms of petitions and what I've had calls about, and as I look at what we're going to be debating over the next little while in this Legislature as a result of this motion to extend the sittings, none of them is going to be addressed.

Alphabetically, I have been called by people about access to children, people who have not had access through some of the laws, particularly by fathers who don't have an opportunity to see their children. None of that is going to be discussed as a result of this motion.

I had a lot of calls regarding the issue of Sunday shopping, going way back, and that's where we're a little frustrated. I spent four weeks a summer ago dealing with that whole issue, only to have the government change its mind. They say they don't have enough time in the Legislature to deal with the issues, yet we spent time debating it the year before last. We spent all summer on hearings on it and then they turned around a year later and changed it. At least now that whole issue has been passed and is behind us.

We also had a great deal of concern on the same issue, as I look down the list here, on crime and sexual offences and Bill 114, which I hope will be introduced.

We had a great deal of concern over the taxation issue and what's happening in this province. We're being overtaxed and people are fed up.

There's a lot of concern about what's going to be happening now as a result of the social contract with commercial labs.

This government isn't trusted by the private sector because of what's happening in day care. They've attempted to drive the private sector out, and have done

that in some of the other areas.

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** Show a little enthusiasm there.

**Mr Carr:** I say to my friend from Durham about enthusiasm, I remember him on those Sunday shopping hearings so enthusiastically, day after day, standing up and saying we should not have Sunday shopping.

**Mr Callahan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think this is a very important issue. The government has felt it's necessary to bring this motion forward to extend the sitting of the Legislature, yet the government can't maintain a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Is there a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Durham East on a point of order.

**Mr Mills:** Mr Speaker, I have great difficulty in keeping my cool in here when, for reasons that are absolutely time-wasting and are costing the taxpayers money, he keeps calling a quorum, when he comes in and out like a jackrabbit.

**The Acting Speaker:** That's not a point of order. It's a requirement to have 20 members present in order to have a quorum, and any member can get up on a point of order and ask for a quorum call. We've had it.

The honourable member for Oakville South had the floor and he may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Carr:** I'm glad to see that the members have come in and are now present and will be listening to the remainder of it. I'm also pleased that the member from Durham is taking fiscal responsibilities with a great deal of enthusiasm. I wish, though, two years ago, when we fought this first budget, he had been there standing with us and fighting for fiscal responsibility, when he was going to "fight the recession and not the deficit" and we did everything we could to stop the budget. Now, as a result of that budget, we're facing the tough economic problems we are facing today.

But I'm glad to see that even though it has taken a while, we now have some of the members opposite talking about the fundamental economic questions. But there isn't anything we're going to be dealing with that is going to help some of the concerns we've got.

The same with the environment and the circumstances we're facing in our own riding, a couple of problems at the Petro-Canada facility out near the Queen Elizabeth Park school that are causing problems there. There is no legislation we're going to be dealing with here that's going to solve the problem for the many people, I think close to 600, who have sent in petitions on that. In fact, when we asked the minister during the estimates

committee, an official actually stood up and said that having a smell in your community is, if you can believe this, a good thing; a member of the Ministry of Environment saying it's a good thing because it means you're prosperous. There are many people who are discouraged with what's happening; there's been no action on that area. This motion to extend the sittings will do nothing to assist the people who are concerned about the environment.

Also, people are concerned about the cutbacks; the Friends of Schizophrenics are concerned about what's happening in the area of hospitals. There's nothing being addressed. Cuts to the services are being made not based on long-term plans and with any fiscal responsibility; they're being cut because of ad hoc problems, financial crises, so they go out and slash. I wish we were debating a motion to extend to deal with some of the positive matters we've put forward to save money to provide for services.

There will be no debate on gambling, which has become a big problem here, particularly for the government members. These motions to extend will do nothing to deal with the issue of gambling. I know there are many people concerned, by the petitions coming in.

There will be nothing for the people who have sent me petitions concerned with haemophiliacs who have contracted HIV. There will be nothing debated, as a result of an extension of this Legislature, that is going to deal with those problems.

#### 1900

There's nothing in there on the concerns out there for seniors, particularly the financial aspect. I got some calls last week from people who are so concerned about their tax level right now. Many seniors, at a time when some of the services are being cut back, are concerned about the financial condition of this province. There's nothing in any of the debates, any of the bills put forward by this government, that will assist those people.

They are concerned about the issues of crime, because it's on the rise. Between 1985 and 1989, violent crimes in this province increased by 37%. Sexual assaults in 1991 had increased by 33% over the previous year. The problem is that many people don't feel safe. It's not just a city problem; it's also a problem that we're facing in many small towns and communities. Our courts are overburdened and cumbersome to the point where, as a legislator and involved in making the laws, I can say our system, even the criminal justice system, doesn't work properly. All you need to do is look at what happened with the Askov decision. We definitely are facing some major problems in that area. Nothing's going to be addressed there.

Nothing's going to be addressed by this government in this Legislature as a direct result of any bills that are coming through, and that is going to be one of the sad

parts of this extension of the sittings. There isn't going to be anything here where anybody is going to be able to say: "Stay. Get that passed. It's going to help." There is nothing in it.

This government, which came in after 20 years of being in opposition, never having an opportunity to form a government, now that it has got power took a great deal of time. They didn't even know what they wanted to do. The time we took off at the break last time, after Christmas, was more than we should have, and then they come in here and say the opposition should be passing the bills quickly. They had no idea what they wanted to do. There was no vision, no plan, no bills ready.

You come into the Legislature and you don't know what bills are going to be debated on any given day. I swear they pick the names, throw them in a hat and pull them out. There's absolutely no long-term plan. No wonder this government is being compared to the Beverly Hillbillies. They have no idea where they're heading, and with some of the areas they do head in, quite frankly, they change their tune a year later because they're heading in the wrong direction.

But we're going to continue to be here. Our function is not only to criticize—and that's very easy to do. As my friend from Etobicoke West has often said, criticizing this government is sort of like being the best hockey player in Somalia. It doesn't take too much. But unlike other opposition parties, what we're going to do is to present some alternatives. That's why we put together some programs in a minority report that goes on for 30 pages about what needs to be done with the economy in the province. It tackles all of the issues out there.

That's why we put together our Blueprint for Learning in Ontario, so we could tackle the issues of education at a time when we hear no answers from the government.

That's why we put together our first New Directions paper over a year ago in which we outlined some of the things that should be done to get the economic climate that will produce jobs, that will allow investment, that will allow businesses to prosper instead of being strangled as they are through many of the programs out there, whether it's overtaxation, whether it's WCB, or whether it's the whole process of how long it takes to get anything approved.

That's why we've been attempting to be pretty constructive over the last little while on what we've put forward, everything from taxation to deficit reduction to spending.

The only good thing about the motion to extend is that we are going to get, day after day, another opportunity to hit this government on what it should be doing. Our function isn't only to criticize. We're going to offer constructive, commonsense solutions that have



been well thought out. I say to the members opposite, I hope at the end of the day they will take a look at some of these proposals and act upon them, because I say if they do, this province will be much better off.

Over the next little while, we are going to, I suspect, have some debates on the government bills they are now bringing forward. There are some that I believe we should be debating, and I am pleased that we are debating this motion to extend because there is some opportunity to have some of these bills that will be going out to public hearings. We need to do that so that we can spend the summer taking a look at them. I hope they won't be bills like we had a couple of years ago with Sunday shopping, where we spent all the time debating in the Legislature, spent four weeks out on committee and then turned around and spent more time debating in here to reverse decisions.

We need to have a long-term plan. That's why all of the things we've put together here for you are offered in the spirit of cooperation. I don't necessarily believe all of them will be acted upon, but some of them certainly should be, because there is a tremendous sense of frustration out there, indeed anger, that governments are not listening, are not doing the right thing, have no comprehensive plan of what to do on the economy, on health care, on education, on the environment.

It's been often said about this government, and I think it's true, that it's managed by headlines. They head in one direction, get a little bit of flak from a particular special interest, then head in another direction. I suspect that's why we've had so many flip-flops. They know that if they put enough pressure on this government, they can change its mind and persuade it.

Some of the things we've talked about, if they are implemented, will make this province indeed much better. We talk about the deficit and the debt and what needs to be done with specific programs. We all realize we're in a problem area when it comes to the deficit. We all know our debt now represents 22% of our gross domestic product, and that's compared to about 15.3% in 1991. We now spend \$1.22 for every dollar we take in, and we've outlined some areas where savings can be made. Hopefully, the government will take a look at them.

We talk about the debt growing and what needs to be done to be able to keep the services that are important to the people of this province, because if we do not take action now, two years from now, a year from now the cuts will need to be deeper, harder and we're going to be in worse shape.

That's why we're so concerned that over the last little while the government never listened. Over the last two years we have presented proposals. We have said that the big concern of the province of Ontario isn't that we need to find more tax revenue under every rock by increasing taxes and fees. The spending in the province

of Ontario is the problem. You're not going to be able to get out of the circumstances you're in unless you scale back the spending. We offer constructive solutions and we will continue to do so.

We also believe the only way to get out of this predicament is to be able to create jobs. It's ironic that when this government came in, the unemployment rate in this province was about 6%. The economists who came before the finance and economics committee came in and said—and they were different; seven or eight of them came in and said unemployment's going to range anywhere from 10.6% to 11.8%. So in some cases, they're even predicting we're going to almost double what it was when this government came in.

Quite frankly, we told you in the last election you can't continue to tax, spend and borrow like there's no tomorrow. You didn't listen, and as a result, the people who are suffering are the people who are out of jobs.

I want to quote one of the chaps who came before the finance committee, as my time almost runs down, because I believe that one of the ways to create jobs is through upscaling the private sector. We supported you in downscaling the public sector; it's too big, it's too large, and we need to scale it back. But we need to have the programs to upscale the private sector.

One of the people who came through said, and he probably said it better than I could: "The only sustainable jobs you're going to get in the long term are from the private sector. Primarily, you've got to have a proper business environment to create jobs and a stable, believable future of taxes that are not going to continue to go through the roof."

That's why we've outlined the proposals we have, because when this government came into power, unemployment was 6%. We're now going to be hitting close to 11% in the province of Ontario. Eighty per cent of the jobs that have been lost have been in Ontario for the entire country. We will average in this province 572,000 people over the last year unemployed versus the 331,000 in 1991 when they took office. Quite frankly, unless we do something in terms of allowing the private sector to prosper, we're never going to get the jobs.

#### 1910

The sad part is that, as I go out and speak to business people, they are saying right now that the kids are coming up but not too many people want to get into business any more. Small entrepreneurs are not doing it, because they say that with all the regulations and taxation, first of all it's very difficult to make money, but even if you do, the government's just going to tax it all away anyway.

One of the business people I met in Belleville said that. He said: "My kids don't want to get into business. One of them wants to be a nurse; one wants to be a teacher." Great professions and admirable, although

today there aren't too many secure jobs there. But they said to their father: "The reason is that we see how hard you work, the hours you spend, how little money, the holidays that you work. And at the end of the day you end up with less than some people who are in the public sector."

Until we reward initiative and entrepreneurship and get this province and the people of this province creating jobs, two years from now when this government comes up for its mandate—and hopefully it will be sooner—we're going to be in one heck of a mess.

We're going to continue to pressure this government. We're going to continue to stay on this government over the next little while to implement some of our policies. We're going to be offering constructive solutions day in, day out. Hopefully they will come up in bills that will make the public better off at the end of the day.

There isn't anything here that we're going to be debating, but I say to this government, you're going to have a summer to put together a program and a plan. We're going to be there to advise you and assist you. If we do it, we're going to be in good shape. If we do not, unfortunately, I believe this province is going to be worse off.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** I'm probably going to surprise you today, because I'm going to speak specifically to the motion before the House and I am not going to go on long, for my full time. Once I have said what I have to say, that should be the end of it and we shouldn't go on unnecessarily. Part of that is because I thought when we came to this place that we were going to actually be doing constructive things, so I'm hoping that perhaps by example I will lead.

However, I want to disabuse the member for Oakville South of the idea that we're over and done with Sunday shopping, because the reality, based on the experience that we've had in the past two and a half years, is that we will probably be debating again for third reading because, guess what? Just for your information, we've averaged, since we became the government, about 171 minutes on third reading debate, when in previous governments the average was as low as 47 seconds and as high as 15 minutes, maximum. But somehow or other, since we became the government, the opposition has raised this up to 171 minutes on average. So the member for Oakville South should get used to the idea that we will probably be debating this again for at least third reading debate, unless you follow the pattern of the past and, at third reading, vote for or against it.

I would also, just as a point of interest, explain why we think we have to go on into July. I mean, I'm not a glutton for punishment. I don't want to sit in July either, if I don't have to. However, when you have examples such as this, this is why we have to sit in July.

I'm going to go as far back as the fall of 1981, when the Conservatives were in government, 44 bills were passed in that session. In the fall of 1987, under the Liberal government, 15 bills were passed that session, because they had come in late in the fall, if you recall. In the fall of 1990, again because we were only in here from November 19 to December 20, we got nine bills passed that session, but even so, from 15 to nine is a tremendous difference.

Spring of 1982 under the Conservatives, 43 bills passed. Spring of 1988 under the Liberals, 40 bills passed. Spring of 1991 under our government, 14 bills. You can use examples like this. The next one: 1982 in the fall with the Tories, 19 bills; 1988 in the fall with the Liberals, 38 bills; 1991 with us, we get 21 bills. And 1983: 50 bills passed under the Conservative government in the spring of 1983. Some 26 bills in the spring of 1989 under the Liberals. Now, 13 bills. Why? Thirteen bills. We're bringing in the same number of bills, yet only 13 bills get passed.

In the fall of 1983, 39 bills under the Tories. It was 45 bills under the Liberals in 1989. How many did we get passed in the fall of 1992? Seven bills. That's unacceptable. In the spring of 1984, 42 bills under the Conservative government. In the spring of 1990—and that was when the election got called, you may recall, even though they called an election far, far too early, to their chagrin—19 bills they still got passed. How many bills have we got passed this spring so far? Six bills.

I'm just going to point out that in these orders we get every day in the House, Orders and Notices, for the benefit of those people who are out there and don't understand what happens here, it lists all the bills that are coming up for third reading, either private members' bills, government bills or private bills that are before the House.

I just want to point out that instead of talking about this and spending time in this debate, we could be talking about Bill 61, an act respecting Algonquin and Ward's islands, in other words, the Toronto Islands bill.

We could be debating third reading on Bill 102, which I'm waiting for. As soon as we're finished, hopefully I'll be able to finish pay equity for women in this province of Ontario.

Bill 164, the Insurance Statute Law Amendment Act: We're waiting for that because more people will be eligible for benefits if we do that.

And I'm not reading them all; I'm just reading some of them.

Bill 169, the Public Service Statute Law Amendment Act: Every public servant in this province would have political rights if this bill ever gets through debate, but we're still waiting.

The budgetary policy of the government is on the agenda as well.



Bill 96, and this one is dear to my heart, is An Act to establish the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board; as soon as it's finished committee of the whole, we can move on into the province of Ontario, but instead we're sitting here on this.

But the one that I think is reprehensible that we haven't even gotten into debate on yet, and we should if we weren't lallygagging around here, is Bill 124, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, Mrs. D. Cunningham.

Mr Speaker, you no doubt have heard from your colleagues, as we have heard as I have sat in the committee and went through the possible bicycle helmet legislation will make history when this bill is passed, because all three parties unanimously favour this; all three parties worked together to get this legislation together. We're sitting here, and we could be debating that if people were being cooperative and working together, but instead that bill will sit and wait again and it won't get passed. It will save lives, so we should be doing this.

I'm just saying that when we have opportunities like this to amend and eliminate the commercial concentration tax, I can remember all the Toronto members in this place cheering when that went up because every hotel in this city wanted it out of the way. Every parking lot in this city wanted it out of the way. We're still waiting for second reading.

It is mind-boggling to me that supposedly logical, thinking people would forgo the opportunity to get this legislation passed. As a consequence of the delaying that is going on in this place and has been going on, unfortunately, for the last two and a half years, I, who am pretty reasonable, I think, have come to the conclusion that if we have to be draconian, so be it. If it means we have to change the rules, so be it, because this is nonsense.

I've got better things to do for my constituents than sit in this House and listen to the kind of debacle that goes on here. I think the time has come that we start looking at, what are we really doing here? Are we serving a purpose? Let's get on with it. We are now going to sit to the end of July, and let us get on with it and get something done in this place. Then at the end of this session, we can honestly say we have accomplished something. The sooner we go, the better.

1920

**Mr Callahan:** That was a stirring speech. In fact, it was so stirring that I'm at a loss for words.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** Why don't you sit down and not give a speech at all?

**Mr Callahan:** The Minister of Transportation, who has just arrived, says I should sit down and not give a speech at all. I would do that, but—Gilles Pouliot is a good friend and has been in the House probably longer

than I have, and I'm going to address, through you, Mr Speaker, my comments to Mr Pouliot. Mr Pouliot knows that this place, like anything else, only works if you have rules and order that make the place work.

Over the last years of the Liberal government, there was an attempt through the House leaders—a successful attempt, I might add—to reform the rules. The reason we had to reform the rules was that the New Democratic Party, when it was in opposition, had the benefit of being able to read petitions until the cows came home. They had the ability to be able to keep us here all night. I have to say that Mr Cooke, the member for Windsor-Riverside, was a master at delaying this place, a master. Mr Charlton was also there—he's probably conferring with him—the present House leader of the New Democratic Party.

So please don't. I would be most offended if the Minister of Transportation, the then Gilles Pouliot, were to shake his head and say they didn't play games. They played the ultimate in games. Suddenly, you're transformed into the government and that, for some reason, gets you beatified. You suddenly become sanctified and sanctimonious and all the rest of it.

For the people who have watched this Legislature—and fortunately, we've had television since about 1985. It was brought in by the Liberals because we felt it was a democratic right for people to be able to view what their elected representatives did. I don't know about the rest of you, but I find in my riding that I have a lot of people who say, "Yes, we were watching the Legislature on television, but, Mr Callahan, I want you to tell us about how it operates, because every time a motion or a bill is introduced in the Legislature for third reading or second reading, the cameras pan over to the government, the New Democratic Party government, and they all vote for it." These people say to me: "Mr Callahan, how can that be? How can you have that number of people ever agree on a single bill? How can that happen?"

I say to them, "First of all, I want to thank you for watching the legislative process because of the democracy that the Liberal government opened up in terms of television." Remember in the days before television? It must have been incredible in here. Unless the press hung around for more than 20 minutes to report what was going on in here, nobody ever heard about it, but today they've got the magic eye on us. I say that every time I get a chance to speak. Those of you in the government who want to come back, you'd better start serving your constituents. Get the hipbone cut off at the waist so you don't vote for every measure your government brings in. Don't let that suave gentleman from Sudbury who is the Minister of Finance cajole you, because what happens in this place—and I think it's time to open up Pandora's box to the people of Ontario, as I have on many occasions, and tell them how this

place works. You pay for 130 members of the Legislature. You pay, on the average, about \$75,000 per member, and these people vote like they're joined at the hip.

If that's the case, what we need is a change in this whole system, because if the people over on that other side, and I can speak, because I was on that other side—the minister of colleges and universities is now leaving with a bad look on this face. I want to tell you, he's one of the superministers.

**Mr Mills:** Why didn't you tell David Peterson all this?

**Mr Callahan:** I did, believe me; you ask my colleagues and they'll tell you I did.

The minister of colleges and universities has just left, and he is one of the superministers. My good friend from Sudbury is the second superminister, the minister of technology, trade, da da da—whatever it is. Frances Lankin is the third superminister. The Premier is the fourth minister. That's the inner cabinet. Nobody else matters.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** What about the Premier's office?

**Mr Callahan:** Well, that's true. Yes. The Minister of Transportation reminds me that there are six unelected spin doctors down there on the second floor who are paid for by the taxpayers as well, along with the four big ministers who make—

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** There's more money for value out of them than there is out of you.

**Mr Callahan:** What was it you said? Repeat it, please.

In any event, for the people who are watching, who are avid watchers, they're going to understand that although they pay for 130 members of the Legislature at about \$75,000 a crack and, for members of the government who have PA jobs where they make an extra \$10,000, they pay \$85,000, they are only getting the benefit of a very select group, a private group.

I have often said in this House—I've said it when I was in government and I will say it now—this is not democracy; this is oligarchy. This is precisely what the people of the province of Ontario and, for that matter, the people of Canada, are so upset with their politicians about: the fact that they pay big bucks to have people whom they've elected in their ridings to represent them, and they don't represent them. They follow the lead of the four superministers and the six unelected members—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Callahan:** Something's happening, because the bears are getting teased. They must realize that what I'm saying is true—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Mississauga South—

**Mr Callahan:** Brampton South, Mr Speaker. I want at least my constituents to know I'm here.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Brampton South has the floor. Interjections are out of order. Many members are not in their assigned seats and they're still interjecting, so please leave the honourable member the opportunity.

**Mr Callahan:** It's a good thing we've got the Speaker here, because the Speaker is the only impartial person in this entire place. The rest of you people have all got your own agenda.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** How about yourself?

**Mr Callahan:** Look, you can accuse me of a lot of things, but I have to say that I will match my speeches in the House against anybody's speeches in the House. I have always spoken what I believe in and not this gobbledegook you see going on in politics. I may get elected or defeated on the basis of that, but so be it. But the fact is that unless this place is changed—

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** You are too sanctimonious.

**Mr Callahan:** The Minister of Finance says I'm too sanctimonious; maybe I am. Maybe I shouldn't be judging myself. Maybe I should leave the judgement to the people in my community. But equally, Minister of Finance, the judgement of your community is the judgement that each and every one of us, as members of the Legislature, have to go through every three or four or five years, and we almost went through it today; if the Tories had not deserted us, we were two votes away from getting rid of your government. If the people out there in Ontario realized that, they would know that the Conservative Party today assisted in buttressing the New Democratic Party so they could have you for another two years. That should be the headline of the day. If there are people out there who are fed up with your government, the Conservatives today gave you the opportunity to do two more years of damage to this province, and they are the people who will regret that.

In any event, going back to the issue again, we're talking tonight about a motion by the House leader—who is not here, by the way; somebody's sitting in his chair, I don't know who it is—to extend the times for sitting of the House. Well, let me tell the people who are watching this program tonight—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** They flipped off about 15 minutes ago.

**Mr Callahan:** The minister of colleges and universities says they flipped off an hour ago. Let me tell you, the young people of this province have probably flipped off, because there are no jobs available, and the opportunities of getting into university have been diminished because of the fact that there have been cutbacks by the



present minister in terms of providing spaces for those good young people. So the minister of colleges and universities perhaps should take this whole discussion a little more seriously.

1930

However, to get back to the question of why the House leader has to extend the sitting hours, let's look at that. According to the standing orders that were negotiated by all parties, we have a fixed calendar for sitting. That fixed calendar was put in place because of a number of reasons. Number one, there are people in this House who have young children and families that they are deprived because they live in far-off communities in Ontario; it was to allow them to order their lives so they could have a valued family life. The second point was, they represent constituents in their own ridings. It was to give them an opportunity to go home and to look after their constituencies.

So what happens? The House leader and the Premier decide: "We won't recess the House. We will prorogue the House." That's a nice big word, prorogue. But I have to explain to the people who are watching that what happens when you prorogue is that under the standing orders the Premier can call the House back as late as he wants. As I think the member for St Catharines was saying, it's to the advantage of the government to call the House back as late as possible because it doesn't want to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, of having to answer questions in the House or having the press gallery sit there for an hour; that's about all they sit there for, and once they've got their quick hit they're gone.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Brampton South has the floor.

**Mr Callahan:** By proroguing, the Premier can delay that sitting. That's what he did: He delayed the sitting for something like four or five weeks. We were supposed to come back right after the March break, and I'm sure the people out there watching know when the March break was. We came back April 4 or April 10 or something like that, far beyond when we should have come back. They say, "We're so anxious to get our agenda going that we're going to come back late." I find that incredible. I can't see how reasonable people watching this telecast can possibly accept that the government is anxious to get its legislative agenda going. If they were, they'd have been back when we should have been back.

Instead, they didn't want to face the public, so they set their own agenda. By proroguing they could do that; if they had recessed, the standing orders would not have allowed them to do that. These are the rules we operate by. These are the rules they're now employing in order to extend the hours. They play by the rules when they want to play by the rules. When the rules are not

convenient, they play by their own rules.

I have to say that any government that does that, first of all, is suspect, because it says, "Here are the rules, but we're going to play our own game." That's what happens with House leaders too; people out there watching television don't realize that this place wouldn't operate unless the House leaders got together and agreed on certain legislation being moved forward. If they didn't do that, it wouldn't work.

Unfortunately, the House leader of the government seems to have this big list he brings to my House leader and the House leader for the Conservatives, and he says: "We have to have that before you leave. You're not getting out of here till we do it."

He's expecting that the Conservatives and the Liberals are going to capitulate and are going to give him readings on those bills like that—in two weeks. I'll tell you something, I'm prepared to stay here, if I have to, until the snow falls, and so is my party. You're not getting those bills with just a snap of the fingers, and I'll tell you why.

The people of Ontario are fed up with the legislation they've brought forward thus far. The legislation they've brought forward thus far has destroyed this province. They want to bring in bills like Bill 34, I think it is.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Be specific.

**Mr Callahan:** I'll be specific. The Minister of Finance says "Be specific." I will be. In Bill 34, which used to be Bill 40, you're going to eliminate the hard-to-serve purposes in the Education Act for learning-disabled kids. Do you think the people of Ontario want me, as their representative, to just fall over and agree to the extension of hours so that kids with learning disabilities who are hard to serve cannot be given that option? You'd better cut it out.

I've talked to the former Minister of Education, who's now the Minister of Community and Social Services, and what he said to me was, "We don't want to have that, because it gives the school boards the out to put the cost on us of sending some kid who can't be served in the schools to some private school." I put to him a positive statement. I said: "If you have a concern about that, why don't you bring in an amendment to the bill to provide that the trustees have to pay half and the province pays half? That way, they're not going to be so quick to put this kid out to some school."

But in the final analysis, that kid who can't be served in the schools, if he has no outlet, you have ruined him, you've doomed him to unsuccess, and you should be ashamed of yourselves. That's the type of legislation you want to extend the hours for, to bring that in. Draconian, absolutely draconian. I just find it incredible. I know a lot about the New Democratic Party and I never expected that you people would ever, ever succumb to the attitude that power is more important than

serving the needs of the people of this province. You've done that.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** That from a Liberal?

**Mr Callahan:** The Minister of Finance has just spoken up. The Minister of Finance has succeeded in bringing in taxes that have brought small business to its knees, to the point where there are no jobs for university students or community college students this summer, nor were there last year.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Callahan:** There's somebody speaking from a seat he shouldn't be sitting in.

**The Acting Speaker:** Yes. I want to remind all members that interjections are absolutely out of order, particularly when members are not in their assigned seats. This is a political place, and yes, there is provocation. Other members will have the opportunity to participate. The member for Brampton South has the floor.

**Mr Callahan:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Again I have to say it's a good thing in this place that there is at least one person who is impartial and will prevent the government and its large numbers from preventing debate in this House.

I have to speak about something the member for St Catharines spoke about: the rules in this House. The rules in this House were changed in a draconian fashion, they were changed in a way that limited debate, and now what we've got is an enlargement of the sitting period. As I said, I and I'm sure many of my caucus colleagues are prepared to sit here till hell freezes over. We're not about to let you guys off the hook. We're not about to let you push legislation through without full debate in this House, without the democratic process.

But I want to tell you something. The purpose of the calendar and the purpose of the rules that were negotiated through the three parties was to allow matters to go out to committee, and the reason they go out to committee is because this august chamber we're all honoured to be in can't be invaded by the common citizen. They can sit in the gallery. They can't come on the floor; they can't talk to us. They can talk to us in committee.

So what this government is doing by delaying or extending the session is that they're delaying the time in which you get the really important stuff, the input from the people of this province, the people who elected you, the people who pay our salaries, the people who hold us accountable politically or through our conscience. We have delayed that. We will delay that right through the summer so no one will have an opportunity to speak out about the elimination of service for young kids with learning disabilities, taking away the rights of the hard to serve.

I think the whip is playing that light. I've got to tell you, buster, I've got to tell you—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Callahan:** I'm sorry. I take back the "buster."

**The Acting Speaker:** Please, yes. Let's keep it on a high plane.

**Mr Callahan:** I'll try to be on a high plane. But when you talk about young children who've got to get a start in this world, and you're going to take away from them the opportunity to have the benefits of everybody else, I have to say to you that that is the worst possible thing you could do.

We have now debated and voted on Bill 48. As I said before, we were within two votes of perhaps changing the perspective of what's happening in this province before it's too late. We weren't supported by the third party in terms of doing that, but Bill 48 is going to create a disaster, as I said before. It will create a disaster that will supersede your government, and that's why I think you don't worry about it. You figure, "Let the Liberals or the Conservatives, if they happen to be the government, pick up the pieces of this province and run with it."

**1940**

You're going to find that this bill has so many holes in it that the transfer partners—and forget the municipalities. I care about the municipalities; I think you should. School boards: important. Children's aid societies are more important. Children's aid societies are required by statute to provide protection for children who can't protect themselves. You have invaded their transfer payments. How are they supposed to look after these young kids?

The Conservative Party talks about wage freezes and attrition. I found that the leader of the third party's position today was a little more advanced. He said, "In terms of police or fire, we'll allow you to hire some people," and I think that was partially because I spoke last night and others spoke last night about the fact that if you have attrition and a wage freeze, how do you cover the police officers who have left and the firemen who've left? Do you just simply do without them? So it was a position that was untenable, but they've changed it so they're going to have new amendments that are going to be brought in.

But you're missing the point. By delaying the sitting, you are eliminating two great possibilities. One of them is to get back to your ridings, to be able to meet with the real people of this world. Down here, it's like being in a big club. You're in your caucus, the caucus says, "Well, do this, do that." "Oh, yeah, I think that's great." Get out into your ridings; talk to the real people. Find out what makes them tick. Find out why they're upset, like in my community where, because of what the—I have to say "my good friend" because he is my good friend, the Minister of Finance. But you've done the



wrong thing, Minister. You've interfered with Canada Day in my riding in terms of fireworks. That doesn't sound very important, but fireworks is one of the few things in my community on Canada Day that people who are of lesser means or perhaps out of work can take their family and their children to for free.

You know why my community did that? Because they don't know what the heck's going on with the social contract. They have no idea what the costs are going to be to them here or down the line. So they're cutting back services now. They're denying—and I've been at Canada Day for the last eight years. That's one of the real treats of having the privilege of being elected as a member of this Legislature: You get invited to all these marvellous events and they introduce you as somebody special. I always say to them: "I'm not special. You people are special. I just got lucky. You elected me." But to look out on the people from the stadium and see them all waiting out there with the families on the blankets—they're going to have a little bit of a picnic, waiting for the fireworks and the music. They're being denied that. I think you have to think very hard about that. If you have a family of your—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It's their choice.

**Mr Callahan:** The Minister of Finance says it's their choice. Minister of Finance, that doesn't befit what I know about you—you're a caring guy—to make that statement. You're talking about people who in the real world are out of work, perhaps losing their homes. The only enjoyment they're going to have with their family is to get together on that blanket, out there as the dusk comes in and the fireworks go off and the band plays—

**Hon Allan Pilkey (Minister without Portfolio in Municipal Affairs):** Other municipalities are carrying on with that program. Why couldn't yours?

**Mr Callahan:** The Solicitor General, I believe it is, says that other municipalities are carrying on with that program. But I'll tell you what: The problem you've got is that with the social contract—and I've gone to my municipal council. They've said to me, "Bob, what's it all about?" They don't know.

Let me address it specifically. In essential services, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, your bill requires that they take off a total of 36 days during the three-year period, and they have to take them off during their paid vacation or their paid holidays.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Not necessarily.

**Mr Callahan:** That's what the bill says, Minister. Read the bill, please. That's what it says.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** —must.

**Mr Callahan:** It says "shall."

That means that they're going to be compensated at the end of the three-year period with 36 days, and if they're compensated with 36 days, it does not take a rocket scientist to realize that if they're essential

services—fire department, police department, nurses, whatever—you're going to have to pay other people to take their place. And what is that doing? That's like Guy Fawkes throwing a bomb into the Legislature with a long fuse on it. That will blow up on the taxpayers of my community and every community throughout Ontario, because they're going to have to pay the bill. So what in fact you're doing is you're delaying the bill.

Let me take it one step further. Let's say that Bill 48 is litigated, and you can bet your sweet bippy that someone is going to take that to court, and when they take it to court the good Attorney General and her civil staff are going to have to defend it if you get a decision at the lower court that says it's unconstitutional because it breaches the fair-hearing provisions of the charter. You then get a decision at the Court of Appeal for Ontario that says, "No, I'm sorry, you were wrong, General Division, that's not right." You then get a decision at the Supreme Court of Canada whatever way, if the Supreme Court of Canada says that it's unconstitutional or if it says it's not unconstitutional.

In the meantime, you've got three years that have passed. That's about the time span it takes, and you have caused utter chaos for this community, for this province, in terms of how does a school board, how does a municipality, how does a children's aid society, how does the whole host of other people who are listed in the schedules to this act plan? How do they budget? Do they underbudget? Do they overbudget? How do they do it? Do they cut services? Do they increase services?

So you have absolutely just thrown them right into a turmoil, and I understand that, because I understand that you people don't believe that you will be around to have to pick up the pieces. But for God's sake, you're Ontarians. You're people who are good enough to run for politics, to get the trust of your constituents. You have to go back to your constituencies. You have to talk to these people whether you're re-elected or not, and you have to tell them why in 1996 this province is in total disarray: Our schools are a disaster. Our learning-disabled kids have no place to go. Our children's aid societies have not been able to serve the neglected children. Our homemakers have not been able to provide the services for those who need it. Our elderly have not been looked after in the retirement homes. There's not enough money to do this or that, all those good things. Surely to God, the preservation of power and the retention of the integrity of this government are not important enough that you would sacrifice that particular principle.

I believe every member is an honourable member. They all believe in the political system. They all believe in caring for their constituents, and surely to God they would not let that happen. I'm prepared to sit here until hell freezes over; I've told you that, as is my caucus.

You are not going to jam bills through this Legislature as far as I'm concerned. We will sit here as long as we have to, but you will have denied the democratic rights to all those people.

But finally what I want to say to you is, and I leave you with this one final message, if you've got a conscience at all, you'd better—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** And you're the only one with a conscience.

**Mr Callahan:** The minister of colleges and universities says I'm the only one with a conscience. That's not true. I'm urging you to join me. If you have a conscience at all, you're going to think twice about every time the government brings forward a measure in the next four or five months that we have to sit that you're joined at the hip. Have some conscience and principle. The member for Victoria-Haliburton, the member for Perth, for Hamilton whatever, they at least have the guts to stand up and say—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you.

**Mr Callahan:** —“God damn it, I'm not going to vote with the government simply because they think they're right.”

**Interjection:** Come on. Withdraw.

**Mr Callahan:** I apologize for the “God damn.”

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Further debate. The honourable member for Simcoe East.

1950

**Mr McLean:** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to comment briefly on the resolution tonight. This resolution is to extend the sitting of the Legislature, commencing Monday 28 June, 1993.

This should never have come before us. If the government was doing its job properly in the first place, we would never have seen this bill.

I would suggest that the people watching these proceedings on television must be thinking this is a summer rerun of a program they saw last year. They watched it last year, because the same thing happened. At this time, the government went through the same charade about how hard it was working to press on with its legislative agenda. Last year we debated extending the sittings until midnight and extended the sittings well past the scheduled adjournment.

I would respectfully submit that if the government was really serious about proceeding with its legislative agenda it would have come back on March 22, when it was supposed to, as the parliamentary calendar stated, rather than hiding and delaying proceedings for three weeks until April 13. The Minister of Finance maybe wasn't hiding all of the time but just part of the time.

In the throne speech of 1990 Bob Rae said: “My government's first challenge is to earn the trust and respect of the people of Ontario. My government's

integrity will be measured by the way this government is run. Our task is to guard against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power.” That's what Bob Rae said in 1990.

I would suggest that Bob Rae and his government colleagues got it all wrong. Their real challenge has been to constantly make excuses for the incompetence of the government, to make excuses for a failure to implement the campaign promises and policies contained in the Agenda for People, to make excuses for systematic dismantling of Ontario's economy and to make excuses for the growing number of unemployed in the province of Ontario.

I would suggest that the root of the problem is the government's agenda itself. It's an agenda that includes an NDP government's budgetary deficit that has been rising too fast, from about \$3 billion in 1990 to more than \$10 billion in 1993. The government's revenue grew during that period by approximately 3.5% or \$1.5 billion. That's their revenues. The government's operating expenditures jumped by 18% or \$7.7 billion during that same period. It's their expenditures that have jumped \$7.7 billion in that short operating time.

It's an agenda that saw this government grab on to the average person's pocketbook again on May 19 and steal more than \$2 billion, the single largest tax grab in Ontario history.

The budget means everybody—people in Orillia or Penetanguishene or Elmvale or Coldwater—will have less money to spend, and that's going to kill jobs and reverse the already fragile economy and the recovery in the major city of Orillia.

It's an agenda that forces Ontario's 839 municipalities to pay for Bob Rae's mistakes by having a total of \$275 million slashed from the transfer payments to the municipal sector. The government wants the people of Ontario to believe that everyone—the government, employers, bargaining agents—is committed to ensuring that the impact of the fiscal reductions is distributed fairly. I would suggest that it's not fair to those municipalities that have already cut their budgets and worked out deals with their employees to take days off work without pay.

I would also suggest that employers, workers, bargaining agents, municipalities and the Ontario PC caucus have taken up the cause of debt reduction and spending controls. It appears that the only group not committed to the cause is the government itself in some of the actions that we see, which is creating chaos long after the municipalities have brought down their budgets and have already made financial commitments to important local charity groups and community programs.

If the government really had a job to do and an agenda to accomplish, we should have been back here



on March 22. Instead, for the second year in a row, this government chose to delay the return of the House. Instead, they've chosen to extend the hours of sittings and to extend the sittings of the House to make up for lost time.

I really think it's time for Bob Rae to get his act together and get on with accomplishing something really positive in this Legislature with regard to legislation. The government claims to have an agenda to accomplish. That agenda appears to include such important pieces of legislation as resolutions to extend the hours of sitting and extend the sittings of the House. We're spending hours and hours debating the extending of sittings. The simple solution to the whole problem would have been to have been here on March 22.

We're not even going to get the chance to look at Bill 105, the Farm Organizations Funding Act; private member's Bill 2, the Heritage Day Act; Bill 162, the Game and Fish Amendment Act, and my private member's bill, Bill 41, the Motor Boat Operators Certification Act. I don't see these or any other pieces of important legislation on the government's agenda. As a matter of fact, there is no agenda. This is a rudderless government that is drifting aimlessly in Ontario waterways without a certificate.

In the 1990 Agenda for People, Bob Rae promised that if elected, they would take a different approach to governing. That's about the only promise that has been kept. Over the past three years, Bob Rae's different approach to governing has resulted in Ontario's economy being battered by high taxation, high unemployment and low productivity. It has resulted in a social structure that is stretched to the limit by soaring costs for health care, education and welfare.

Ontario's economic and social problems are far too pressing and real to allow the socialists the luxury of playing games with resolutions like this one we're currently debating tonight.

Bob Rae and his colleagues claim they're attempting to fine-tune the Ontario political economy, but Canadian humorist and political economist Stephen Leacock said once, "The subject is called political economy because it has nothing to do with politics and nothing to do with the economy." I agree with Mr Leacock. I would suggest that the resolution has nothing to do with the job we were elected to do nor the agenda the NDP government claims it wants to accomplish.

We have had no debate on the budget. The County of Simcoe Act has not been brought through for second reading. The night sittings on previous legislation, when the agenda said we should have them, were right and proper.

There are new rules that were brought into this Legislature and I submit that those new rules were brought in to make sure Mr Kormos was under control.

The agenda of this Legislature has been changed. It's this government that shortened the agenda. There are fewer sitting days. There are provisions made to sit in the evenings. This government cannot contain its agenda.

The member for Sudbury, Ms Murdock, indicated that the passage of bills when we were in government was 44 in some sessions. They have claimed that they have passed 14. I can tell you where the difference is. When we brought in legislation, we brought in legislation that was good. It didn't need a whole bunch of amendments. The legislation that I have seen your administration bringing in here has had the need for amendments, amendments and amendments. Bill 48, which got second reading today, will have some amendments or it will never get to third reading. We have made that quite clear. We want those amendments because they're needed.

I remember when the third party wouldn't let the government, at that time the Liberals, bring in its budget in this Legislature. Could you just surmise what would happen if they were still in government and you were in opposition and they brought in a bill such as the social contract? What would have happened? I can tell you that the House would never have been sitting again. They would have brought it to a complete halt.

When we look at the items of bills that are yet to be debated, I submit to you, Mr Speaker, that this order of the debate on times remaining on bills, I've never seen until this week. This is the last week the House is sitting. I want to know where the list of priorities of the government was a month ago, six weeks ago. Where were they?

**2000**

I can tell you that my House leader is telling me that they couldn't even get a meeting with the government House leader. He didn't want to meet to talk about what legislation they have. That's what I'm getting from my House leader. It's unfortunate that maybe your House leader is telling you something different. That may be. But I'm telling you that we've never seen the agenda. Our House leader could not get an agenda, so we didn't know exactly what was going on.

I'm here to tell you that there's a problem, and I can tell you where the problem is. It's the problem that some people have no idea how to negotiate. I know the members, the House leaders for our party and for the Liberal Party, have been involved in negotiations in this Legislature for many years. They know how to give; they know how to take. They want to play it both ways, and you've got to when you're dealing with House leaders.

Unfortunately, the House leaders that you have been used to having have wanted it one way. I'll tell you, Mr Speaker, that just does not work here, having it one way. There's got to be some communication, some

sawoff of what could happen. I could tell you that you could do all the legislation and business here in three days if the House leader of the government wanted to sit down and negotiate and deal with the other House leaders in this Legislature.

There's been a lot of communication with regard to Bill 48, which is the social contract. I want to relate to some of that, because I've got 18 minutes left and I don't want to use all of that. But I want to put some things on the record, because on Monday, June 14, the government introduced two bills for first reading, the Social Contract Act and the Ministry of Health Expenditure Control Plan Statute Law Amendment Act.

This second act, introduced almost at the end of the sitting by the Minister of Health, received little attention but has such far-reaching implications for doctors and the public that I felt it urgent you understand the views of the medical profession.

The legislation's not cutting back 5% on expenditures on doctors for the next three years, as that is. There is a much larger, more sinister agenda at play here, a plan by the Ministry of Health to override almost all of the OMA's agreements with government and impose massive cuts on medical services and patient care.

We challenge members of the provincial Parliament to take note of what the government is doing and to decide whether or not it is appropriate for government to have the very great powers it is now claiming as its own. I would like to concentrate on two broad implications of the legislation: the effect on patients and the public, and the effect on the relationship between doctors and the government, and, ultimately, how this will impact on patients and the public.

As you know, the government has decided to reduce expenditures in health care by a staggering \$1.6 billion. One of the ways it intends to do this is by giving itself the power under the Expenditure Control Plan Statute Law Amendment Act to cut the number of services that it will pay for patients. Specifically, that act would give the Minister of Health the power at any time to say that if a patient has received a service on one or more occasions, the patient would not have further access to the service, or if a physician has rendered the service before, the physician would not be paid for providing the service on another occasion.

This gives the government the power to say, for example, that if your child had an ear infection and needs more than the government-dictated number of visits, those medical services might not be covered by OHIP or, worse, they might not be available at all.

There are no limits on what services can be restricted by government under this legislation. The legislation is not specific to physiotherapy or eye examinations, as originally proposed in the expenditure control plan for physician services. The power to ration insured and

medically necessary services applies to everyone and everything, and the number of medical services deemed appropriate can be decided unilaterally by some bureaucrat whose mandate extends no further than saving money.

Those are some of the comments that I have received from the medical profession with regard to some of what the Premier had to say. The Premier came to speak at the OMA's board of directors, and he said at the time:

"There is no fairness in a system that allows the government to dictate unilaterally your level of pay in which one insurer has all the political cards, can't work without checks and balances, profession's fees to speak out on the quality of care, a partnership in which planning decisions about the system emerge from a genuine dialogue and not from the cabinet room alone. Above all, a sense of fairness comes through the management of the system.

"These are all essential if the health care system is to maintain the confidence of everyone working in it, as well as the public it serves. Fair arbitration between the professions and the government is a critical element in creating a more open health care system. You have a right to it under the international law and under every standard of natural justice."

Compare what Mr Rae said then to what he is saying now. He is giving himself the power to dictate unilaterally what services patients will receive and what doctors are paid. He is eliminating the checks and balances.

Mr Speaker, there's a lot to the agreement that is being proposed and I can tell you that the medical profession has certainly raised many issues and important issues, because it wants to join in the opposition of many people with regard to the legislation which promises to have a profound negative impact on our ability to provide high quality medical services.

"The doctors of this province are not a valuable and necessary element of the effective management of health care services. The people of this province know this and they deserve less." I indicated they are a valuable, necessary element.

The pharmacists' association has raised some issues with regard to the context of Bills 29 and 48 and the Premier who said: "We also urge government to create a system of fair and binding arbitration that was acceptable to doctors and other health professions. There's no fairness in a system that allows government to dictate unilaterally your level of pay." Exactly what is the Premier doing now if he's not dictating the level of pay?

To wrap up, I'm pleased to see the House leader of the government here. It's about time that he took some notes from this debate. As I had indicated before, there



has been a problem in the Legislature with a lack of communications. In my opinion, the House leaders have not been able to make agreements as they have done in the past. This Legislature has run on a program whereby the three House leaders would make agreements and that's the way this Legislature operated. The information that I have and what I've seen going on here is that there appears to be a one-way dialogue, where the two opposition House leaders do not appear to be part of the system.

I remember, when this Legislature came back on April 13, instead of March 22, it took almost three weeks for the House leaders to get together to make some progress in this Legislature. There's no need for this debate tonight. There's no need for this Legislature to prolong the sittings of this House. There's no need of this Legislature dealing with what this House leader is proposing because I can tell you, Mr Speaker, we brought in an agenda, we have a calendar, and my goodness, if they can't even go by a calendar, what have we got to go by?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate? Minister?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I guess the interesting comments of the last speaker—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pardon me, are you speaking on the motion?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** You already have spoken on the motion.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Mr Speaker, I'm simply rising to move that the previous question now be put.

2010

**The Deputy Speaker:** Minister?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Mr Speaker, I'll speak very briefly. I do want to point out that this debate is the type of debate in this place that used to be considered to be a routine debate, a motion that was dealt with without much debate at all. We've now been debating this since 4 o'clock this afternoon, four hours—

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You had recognized the government House leader. I would think in the rotation that it would then come to our side. I wonder if you could help us with that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I understand that.

**Mr Beer:** I distinctly heard the government House leader speaking. His lips were moving.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please, if you want to take your chair, I'll explain. I made a mistake. I should not have recognized him; therefore, it's the turn of the member for Windsor-Riverside and then after that, when he's through, I will recognize as normal to rotation.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** As I was saying, this is very much

a routine matter that should be treated as a routine motion. The only substance to the motion at all is that we have asked that the House be allowed to sit past its regular sitting time to complete the government's work, which is fully within the right of the government to ask the Legislature.

In fact, if I consider some of the debates that have taken place in this place before—last year we were moving a motion at one point to adjourn the House, to allow the House to adjourn for the summer, and we had a lengthy debate in this place because the opposition was saying, "No, no, the Legislature should remain in session."

Tonight we're trying to put a motion forward so that the House can be extended, and what's the reaction of the opposition parties? "No, the House can't sit." I wish they could get their act together, but I guess they take the traditional role of opposition parties: No matter what the government proposes, no matter what the circumstances are, the opposition parties decide to oppose it.

I think it's important that we understand that this debate has now been going on for over four hours. It's clearly a routine motion put forward to extend the Legislature. There is work that has to be completed by this Legislature before the House can adjourn for the summer.

The debate that has taken place for the last four hours has hardly been on topic. There has been very little discussion about the substance of the motion itself. In fact, if members of the Legislature want to debate the topics that have been debated this afternoon in this four hours, we will have ample opportunity to do that as long as this motion carries and is dealt with. So I think the most appropriate thing to do is to vote on the motion and get on with the business of the Legislature in a productive way by having substantive debates.

If we take a look at some of the precedents that have taken place in this Legislature on routine motions, on motions dealing with items like this, it is not unusual and has happened on several occasions that four to four and a half hours after the debate has begun, closure has been moved and the Speaker has ruled that closure has been in order. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I hope that when I move this motion, you will rule in favour of it based on the precedents of this Parliament and the sittings of this Legislature.

Having listened to lengthy debate this afternoon on a routine motion, I would move that the question now be put.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This whole thing is totally out of order. As I understand it, the member for Simcoe East made his remarks. There are supposed to be two-minute comments from various members—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** No, not on this, not on the motion.

There hasn't been all afternoon.

**Mr Eves:** Not on this? So you're telling me that you're going to move closure after two rotations. Is that what you're trying to tell me? We may as well go to Yugoslavia. We'll set parliamentary tradition back here 5,000 years. That's the first time in history that's ever been done.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Bruce on a point of order.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** As you know, Mr Speaker, we have been operating in this Legislative Assembly now for some time under the new rules that have been brought in by the members of the New Democratic Party. The New Democratic Party has indicated that members cannot speak for very long periods of time.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Is this debate or is this a point of order?

**Mr Elston:** It's a point of order. Listen up.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Let's hear the point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. No, no, please.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. Order. Order.

**Mr Elston:** As I was saying before I was interrupted by the member for Windsor-Riverside, who brought in the draconian rules that now we operate under, we were allowed before these rules to speak for a considerable length of time as individual members. A member could go on for a good amount of time.

Now the rules are such that a member, the leadoff speaker for each party, can take only 90 minutes. That's okay, 90 minutes for that person, I think, is ample time for putting the case for the party in the view of the critic or the leadoff speaker. But each member is allowed under the rules to speak for 30 minutes in total after that, each one in turn.

Now what we have had is two members speaking on behalf of our party, two members, and we have been required to stay by the rules, to speak by the rules, and that is what we have done. The Conservative Party has likewise had two people only speak on this item, one member for an hour and a half, as he is allowed to do under the rules, the restrictive rules that have been brought in by this draconian government.

They have had a second member who spoke for 30 minutes, as is allowed under the rules. The other party in turn set up its member, the member for Sudbury, for 10 minutes—

**Ms Murdock:** Eight minutes.

**Mr Elston:** Eight minutes. Actually, it just seemed like 10. I can tell you that they now have assumed their position to try—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. I cannot listen with all these interruptions. Please respect the order of the Chair to prevent interjections. The member for Bruce, you have the floor.

**Mr Elston:** Now, in turn, the New Democratic Party has put up another member. He has now used up—the clock is still moving, but he used up to about four minutes of a 30-minute time allocation for that member.

There are 130 members—actually 129 members—now elected to this assembly, and I can tell you that the rules are designed to allow as many members as is possible to speak on any particular issue. The rules have said that we can only speak for certain amounts of time, and to indicate that the speaking on this item by seven people out of 129 is enough expression of opinion about the merit of this particular motion is of very little or no—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I just want—

**Mr Elston:** If we cannot have more than seven people speaking in this chamber on any item, it would be a travesty, it would be a prevention, it would be an overruling of democracy. In fact what has occurred already is that the New Democratic Party has had three members—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. Thank you, I've heard enough. Order, please. I have to decide if the rights of the minorities have been infringed upon. In my opinion, there was ample time for both the opposition and the third party to debate the issue. Therefore, I am concluding that the question be now put is in order.

Mr Cooke has moved that the question be now put.

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This will be a 30-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 2019 to 2049.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mr Cooke has moved that the question be now put.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Abel, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Farnan, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock (Sudbury), North, O'Connor, Owens, Pilkey, Pouliot, Rizzo, Silipo, Swarbrick, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.



**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time.

**Nays**

Beer, Brown, Callahan, Cleary, Drainville, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Jackson, Marland, McLean, Miclash, Murdoch (Grey), O'Neil (Quinte), Runciman, Villeneuve, Wilson (Simcoe West).

**The Deputy Speaker:** The ayes are 62, the nays are 19. I declare the motion carried.

Mr Charlton has moved government notice of motion number 5. Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This will be a 30-minute bell.

Is it the same vote? A 30-minute bell.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please allow me to make my proper comments. This, in my opinion—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. This, in my opinion, is uncalled-for behaviour. It really is.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I certainly agree. If the government whip does not know that no member is allowed on these steps, then it is pretty awful.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I will take five minutes just to think of what I should do next. Please, ring the bell. Five minutes.

*The House recessed at 2054 and resumed at 2059.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please take your seats. I have received a request from the member for Leeds-Grenville and a request from the member for Frontenac-Addington, and the vote on government notice of motion number 5 will be deferred to 5:45 on June 24, tomorrow.

Let me please remind the House that this is our House. There's a decorum. There are traditions. There are procedures. We must respect them, please. We must respect them. We must respect the Chair. The Chair represents you.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I expect that, as there are new and interesting rulings here, you will get the type of activity that just occurred as people rushed to the Chair. My concern, sir, when I rose on the point of order, was that two problems existed with the filing of the notices: one, that there were two people who tried to do it at the same time; second, that they both had delivered the notices to you prior to the beginning of the bells. Under the rules, you

accept the deferral notices at the time the bells start to ring to call the members in.

I was only asking, sir, that the ringing of the bells occur to perfect a delivery and so that we could acknowledge that the rules of the House require delivery of the deferrals inside the time the bells are ringing to call the members in.

Thirdly, I would ask, in light of what has just occurred, if it is the ruling that you accept Mr Runciman's notice, which I agree with, I would like some understanding, sir, to prevent any of these races in the future, that there be a ruling delivered that indicates quite clearly that a delivery of a notice of deferral under, I guess it's 28(g), would actually indicate that you would accept the deferral to the latest time that is being requested, and that each of the whips of the parties could deliver a notice of deferral inside the time that the members are being called for the vote.

That was my only reason for standing, but I can tell you, sir, that as long as things remain relatively unstable here, you will find that we will all have to do foot races to your chair to try to gain some paramountcy, but I want you to provide us with a ruling.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Order.

The member for Bruce, you're totally right. The bells were asked to be rung, and then I think you had ample time to bring me the deferred vote. You didn't have to rush that way, please. I hope this will never happen again.

**Hon Fred Wilson (Minister without Portfolio and Chief Government Whip):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to apologize, sir, for my unparliamentary action. It was unconscionable and I do apologize. I assure you, sir, it won't happen again.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I will also extend my apologies to the House. I think it was inappropriate activity on the part of both members, and I do indeed apologize.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. This is our House and we should be proud of our House.

PAY EQUITY AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'ÉQUITÉ SALARIALE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for third reading of Bill 102, An Act to amend the Pay Equity Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'équité salariale.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Mr Mahoney, I believe, was the last one to debate on that third reading. Mr Mahoney is not here; therefore, I will recognize the—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** For obvious reasons.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pardon?

**Mr Elston:** For obvious reasons.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I will recognize the member for Willowdale.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I'm very pleased to be able to take part in this debate, which that is a debate that was unexpected at this time, and I note that my friend from Mississauga, Mr Mahoney, who had the floor, will now be denied the opportunity to complete the speech that he wishes to make.

I know there are people who have to prepare for this debate, because the government brought in closure on what we were debating previously, so accordingly, Mr Speaker, I move to adjourn the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Willowdale has moved the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

*The division bells ran from 2107 to 2137.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Mr Harnick has moved adjournment of the debate. All those in favour of the motion, please rise and remain standing. Thank you. Please be seated.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. All those opposed to the motion, please rise and remain standing.

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 20, the nays are 59.

**The Acting Speaker:** The ayes being 20 and the nays being 59, I declare the motion lost. I believe the member for Willowdale has the floor.

**Mr Harnick:** This is a bill that is of some significance to the province of Ontario and it's a shame that the government sits there plotting to bring its next closure motion so that it can ram another one through and get on with the next piece of business, so that they can go on their two months' summer vacation.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Blah, blah, blah.

**Mr Harnick:** The Treasurer says, "Blah, blah, blah," but this truly is an important piece of legislation and it's a piece of legislation that demands serious debate—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Harnick:** —and I am going to say something about this bill that's serious.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Good. We're waiting for this.

**Mr Harnick:** In spite of the Treasurer taunting me, I'm going to try and say something about this bill that's

significant and serious. This bill provides two additional comparison methods for determining pay equity. It deals with concepts known as proportional value and proxy comparison, but implements them one year later than was originally scheduled because the Treasurer, I suppose, has recognized that we're in a deep recession, he's broke and many businesses are on the verge of being broke.

But at any rate, these two new comparison methods are intended for use when the standard method of job-to-job comparison of male and female job classes in the same establishment is inappropriate. So we now are looking at two new concepts. The first is proportional value comparison. This is a method of indirectly comparing female and male job classes in the same establishment based on the value of the work performed, and it will now take effect January 1, 1993. It will not be retroactive to January 1992, as it was originally intended. This postponement recognizes that retroactivity is not realistic in the workplace because the workplace is facing tough economic times. This was a very, very astute observation by the Minister of Labour, that those who run businesses are having economic difficulties.

I can tell that very few people are interested in what I'm saying. People are moving around and making a lot of noise and, accordingly, because of that I am going to move adjournment of the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr Harnick has moved adjournment of the House.

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members; a 30-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 2142 to 2213.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr Harnick has moved adjournment of the House. All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 10 and the nays 56; I declare the motion lost. The member for Willowdale has the floor.

**Mr Harnick:** As I was saying before the 30-minute bell ringing, there are two new comparison methods that are intended for use when the standard method of job-to-job comparison of male and female job classes in the same establishment is inappropriate. The proportional value comparison I started to explain, but no one wanted to listen and that's when we decided to adjourn the House. So I'm going to try again.

Proportional value comparison is a method of indirectly comparing female and male job classes in the same establishment based on the value of the work performed, and we're now going to use January of 1993



and not the retroactive January 1992 time to implement this particular comparison method.

As I said before, the postponement—and this is very significant—recognizes that the Treasurer and even the Minister of Labour recognize that retroactivity to January 1, 1992, is not realistic because of the difficulties that the workplace faces in terms of the difficult economic times.

The second method of comparison is proxy comparison. Now, that is to be used only in the broader public sector after all other methods have been attempted. It's designed to allow comparisons between female-predominant organizations, such as home care, nursing homes, child care, with another comparable organization in the public sector. This method is expected to benefit an estimated 80,000 women and is now scheduled to take effect on January 1, 1994.

What is very significant is a recognition of the economic times. I think that is something that everybody has to understand, because in the economic climate that we are now in—and I'm quoting an article by Donna Laframboise in the *Toronto Star* on December 7, 1992, page A15. She makes some very, very astute observations. She says that in such an economic climate—and that's the economic climate that I just referred to. She says that because of such a difficult economic climate, we have difficult questions that have to be asked: "For example, is it wise to enforce a pay equity timetable that would end up hurting some of the most vulnerable working people in the province?"

The writer goes on to state: "What should our government's first priority be? Increasing the salaries of people who are lucky enough to have jobs or creating new jobs for those who are unemployed?"

We have to say to ourselves, when someone is fortunate enough to have a job, are they prepared to have their salary increased because of pay equity and then end up having their job lost and having nothing? That's the very important question that this writer asks.

Then she goes on to say: "To be sure, it's difficult not to have sympathy with the hundreds of thousands of women who will now have to wait up to three more years for pay equity, but it's worth noting that it's against the law for an employer to reduce anyone else's salary in order to achieve pay equity within a particular establishment."

So what the writer is saying is that the alternative to losing jobs would maybe be adjusting everyone's salary and lowering the salaries so that the amount of money that's available would ensure everyone a job.

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** The Tories are always looking for the lowest common denominator.

**Mr Harnick:** The writer goes on to say: "But it's worth noting that it's against the law for an employer to

reduce anyone else's salary in order to achieve pay equity within a particular establishment. Therefore, with limited dollars available, there's a good chance that organizations compelled to institute pay equity at this time will have to lay off some employees."

The member from Scarborough shouts across at me that we're prepared to accept the lowest common denominator. The fact of the matter is, Mr Speaker—and I'm going to speak to you rather than try and debate with them as they shout across the floor and have no idea what they're talking about—that if their own legislation dealing with the social contract, where their own Premier is trying to create a scheme where people don't lose their jobs, where people aren't massively laid off, if that hasn't come home to roost to the people who are now shouting at me on the government side, like the member for Scarborough.

**Mr Owens:** Scarborough where?

**Mr Harnick:** Is it Agincourt? No. Give me a hint. Scarborough Centre.

If they haven't understood what it is that their Premier's trying to accomplish, and when they shout out at me that we're looking at the lowest common denominator, what I say to you is that we are looking for legislation today that creates jobs. We're not looking for legislation that's going to lay more people off.

*Interjections.*

2220

**Mr Harnick:** This writer, I might add, has very sympathetic ties to the socialist movement, but that's something they don't want to recognize, as they shout across at me. But this writer has those leanings, and she recognizes that it's important just to have a job. At any rate, the writer goes on to say:

"This is a disturbing prospect for at least three reasons. First, many of these laid-off workers would be forced to apply for unemployment insurance, a social program already under severe strain.

"Second, since those with the least seniority tend to be laid off first, there's a good chance that visible minorities would be overrepresented among the casualties." In other words, in the name of enforcing pay equity, we might be undermining much of the progress that has recently been achieved through affirmative action programs.

"Third, young people, some of whom have large student loans looming over their future, would also be extremely vulnerable to layoffs. Since there are already grave concerns about the high level of unemployment among our youth and the despair this is engendering within that generation, do we really want to contribute further to this problem?"

*Interjection.*

**Mr Harnick:** The member for Scarborough Centre persists in shouting across the floor, and I tell you, this

is a debate that was provoked by his own House leader, who closed down the debate we were dealing with before. They don't want to debate; they just want to shout at me. Accordingly, I am moving adjournment of the debate, and you can blame the member for Scarborough Centre.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to say to the honourable member for Willowdale that he has moved two dilatory motions at this point in time; accordingly, in terms of looking at Beaufort, there has to be some reasonable intervening procedure.

**Mr Harnick:** That was reasonable. It was substantive.

**The Acting Speaker:** I'm sorry, no. I cannot entertain another dilatory motion at this time. Let us proceed with the debate.

The honourable member for Parry Sound on a point of order.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** Perhaps the Chair would like to give some direction to the members of the Legislature as to what substantive business is. I take it from your ruling just now that nine minutes of substantive debate on a particular bill is not substantive, that there's not enough interval of time. What is it? Is 90 seconds enough? Do you need 90 hours? Do you need nine minutes? You might give us some direction. I always thought you couldn't move closure after two rotations either, but I learned something new tonight.

**The Acting Speaker:** I will give a response to the honourable House leader. Essentially, the honourable member for Willowdale moved—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. I'm trying to explain the ruling of the Chair. The honourable member for Willowdale asked for the House to adjourn debate. That was refused by the House. The honourable member then moved the adjournment of the House. That was refused by the House. The honourable member has not, in my view, used adequate time, in that there's not enough of a procedure that has been gone through at this point in time. I would say that the honourable member needs to continue his remarks and, at an appropriate moment, a dilatory motion may be moved again.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If 10 minutes is not enough, what is enough? You must give us instruction and guidance on what is substantive. You can't just keep on going and going like this. How much is it? I ask for your ruling.

**The Acting Speaker:** It is not a matter of time; it is a matter of the procedure that's being done. The honourable member has not used his time at this point in time. The House has said no to two dilatory motions that he quite properly put in terms of the procedure.

**Mr Elston:** And now you're not going to allow him to move a third.

**The Acting Speaker:** That is correct.

**Mr Elston:** Ever? During this time period?

**The Acting Speaker:** In the period of time that this member has to finish his remarks.

**Mr Elston:** You will not allow him—

**The Acting Speaker:** As far as those dilatory motions are concerned, no. He may offer other motions.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm looking through the standing orders and I can't find a definition of substantive debate. If there is a ruling declining to place this motion before the house because there has not been substantive debate, then I need to have a definition of substantive debate. Otherwise, depending on who is in the Chair, we are going to have individual interpretations of substantive debate.

**The Acting Speaker:** I have indicated to the honourable member that I will not entertain a dilatory motion at this point.

**Mr Elston:** When will you?

**The Acting Speaker:** I've said the honourable member must continue his discussion. He has time on the clock. He must continue. There will not be a dilatory motion accepted at this point in time.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Considering the fact that you've taken up at least five minutes of the member's time, I would ask that—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** If you will allow me to finish my point of order.

**The Acting Speaker:** I'm listening.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm trying to put it across, but I'm raising hackles here. Considering the fact that there have been more than five minutes taken off the member's time while you were in the midst of ruling and hearing points of order, through no fault of the member's, could I ask that you put the five minutes back on the clock and not penalize him for the five minutes when it was through no fault of his own, Mr Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker:** I hear what the honourable member is saying. This was brought about because of the motion that was put by the honourable member; therefore, I ask the honourable member for Willowdale to please continue with his remarks.

**Mr Harnick:** Mr Speaker, it will be extremely ironic when I finish, when the government stands up and moves closure on this bill as well. That's the irony of the position that this Legislature's now being put in.

It's interesting that you can stand here and talk about substantive measures, measures substantive enough to



get the member for Scarborough Centre to start shouting at you, but when I move the motion I moved, I'm told I haven't said anything of substance.

I might tell you, without intending to give you the impression that I'm challenging the Chair, that what I was saying was substantive. In the sense that it was substantive, and I can repeat it all again if you'd like to hear it, the intervening business was significant enough, in my estimation, and what you've told me is that I have not been (a) speaking for long enough or (b) saying anything of substance. Without challenging your ruling and with respect, I take issue with you on that matter.

**Mrs Marland:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I apologize to my colleague, but on page 38, standing order 45(b), I would refer you to that standing order and ask you if it applies to the motion for adjournment placed before you by the member for Willowdale.

2230

**The Acting Speaker:** Let me repeat again what I said to the honourable members: There needs to be an intermediate proceeding. It is the tradition in terms of Parliament that an intermediate proceeding is not reckoned to be a speech or a part thereof. The only precedent that is set under this is the 17 hours that Mr Kormos was engaged in in the last Parliament.

In terms of that 17 hours, there are two factors that need to be considered: The first was that that was a period of time when there was unlimited debate; secondly, the Speaker ruled on a very similar situation to this and indicated to the honourable member that he would not accept another dilatory motion unless there was an intermediate proceeding. In this case, it meant Mr Kormos being engaged in a very long period of debate in the House before another dilatory motion was made.

So my ruling stands. I will not accept any more dilatory motions from this member and I would ask the honourable member to please take the floor and to continue.

**Mr Harnick:** Mr Speaker, we certainly have rewritten the rule book tonight, I think. Let me begin the next intermediate proceeding—or let me continue my intermediate proceeding, no matter what you say, Speaker. I notice that in all the deliberations between the Chair and the Clerk and the decision-making, I've now lost probably 10 minutes. If those weren't intermediate proceedings—there were deliberations going on, points of order, portions of a substantive speech—I don't know what an intermediate proceeding is.

At any rate, the writer goes on to say, "There aren't any easy answers, of course, and to be fair, women performing low-wage jobs such as child care, which appear to have been historically undervalued precisely because they're done by women, are entitled to ask how

long they're expected to subsidize the rest of society."

"However," the writer goes on to say, "we all need to start coming to terms with the fact that there isn't an unending supply of money." I know there are still people on that side of the House who believe that there's an unending supply of money for anything, people who never have had to meet a payroll, people who give 5% raises to their non-profit housing corporation when the province is bankrupt. They've never had to meet a payroll, and they understand that there's a never-ending supply of money. They sit and they laugh and they giggle and all of these things are just meaningless to them. You know why? Because they've never had to meet a payroll. They've never in their lives had to worry about an employee. They've never had to worry about somebody and whether they had a job or kept a job.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Harnick:** That was just as an aside, Mr Speaker.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Aside from what?

**Mr Harnick:** The writer goes on to say, "However, we all need to start coming to terms with the fact that there isn't an unending supply of money." In other words, when the province is going broke and freezing salaries and people are worried about layoffs, the non-profit housing corporation can't give its directors 5% raises and have the minister approve it.

At any rate: "For every large corporation whose obscene profits make headlines, there are thousands of smaller businesses that are barely getting by these days. Furthermore, we have to begin to appreciate the fact that in addition to providing jobs to significant numbers of people, many of these business are owned and operated by ordinary, conscientious men and women, not black-hatted capitalists intent on ripping off their employees."

I tell you, the person who wrote this article is hardly a capitalist, probably a dyed-in-the-wool socialist like the Minister of Housing, but she recognizes that there isn't money to go around to do all these things and that pay equity is going to cause people to lose jobs.

If you want to take a practical look at pay equity—in my office, my humble office in Queen's Park where I have a staff, I was told I had to implement a pay equity plan. I hired staff. They were all being paid the same amount of money but, because of gender, I had to give one of my assistants a raise according to a pay equity plan whereas the other employees didn't get a raise.

Now, quite apart from the fact that they were being paid the same amount of money, the pay equity plan arbitrarily, because of gender, gave someone in my office a raise when someone else didn't get a raise. They both started working at the same time. They both

started at the same level. One got a raise; one did not get a raise.

You know, one has to start taking a practical look at what employment pay equity is all about in the workplace, how employment is affected by pay equity.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Harnick:** Quite frankly, as this place tends to lose control again and again, we can see that this plan is not being approached in a practical, commonsense way. People are going to lose jobs. The money isn't there.

In the last couple of minutes that I have remaining I'd like to refer to a Globe and Mail article published in January 1993 where reference was made to a Statistics Canada report. In that report it indicated that women's wages rose to 69.9% of men's wages, from 67.6% the year before, a 2% increase. But what does this 2% increase really mean? It doesn't mean women are being paid nearly one third less to do the same job, even though there are some within the government who suggest that men are being paid one third more to do precisely the same job as a woman within the same company.

What we would expect is that since society's attitudes towards women's work and education have changed only relatively recently, the difference in average wages would be least among the young.

We find that while full-time working women over age 55 earn 63.6% of the income of their male counterparts in the same age bracket, the same woman who is younger and aged 15 to 24 earned an average of 86.4% as much as a man in the same age group. That is 23% more between women over age 55 and women between the ages of 15 and 24. So you can see that age is making a difference as far as the payment for women in jobs is concerned.

So by artificially trying to take pay equity and impose it on a fragile economy, what we are effectively doing is taking people out of the employment market. We're taking jobs away from people who, because of their age, because of their education, have reached a situation of parity without having to pay any money into plans.

Now what we're going to do is we are going to implement a plan that is going to, by necessity, have people lose jobs. I know that the Premier has worked hard to try, with the social contract, to ensure that people don't lose jobs. This act is a contradiction in the sense that people are going to lose their opportunities.

I've been very pleased to be able to take part in this debate. I believe pay equity is a very worthwhile goal. Pay equity and parity were being reached without artificial implementation of certain schemes.

**Hon Gigantes:** Oh, ho, ho, ho.

**Mr Harnick:** And I hear the Minister of Housing, who didn't hear a word I said in terms of the statistical approach. At any rate, my time is completed and I thank you for the opportunity.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** A point of order, the member for Parry Sound.

**Mr Eves:** Mr Speaker, I'm confused, I guess, at the best of times, but I would like a few explanations, please. There have been a couple of different Speakers in the chair this evening and I have seen a couple of unique things, I believe, in my time at Queen's Park, happen here this evening and I'd like an explanation from the Speaker, if you don't mind.

2240

I have seen closure moved after two rotations of a very substantial motion which extends the sitting time of the Legislature when the government that's moving the motion has for two consecutive years shortened the parliamentary calendar by three weeks and resumed the House three weeks after the parliamentary calendar said it should.

Six weeks a year they're on vacation or doing whatever the hell it is they do when they're supposed to be here. They've shortened the legislative agenda by 12 weeks over two years and now they're concerned that they're running out of time. Oh, I'm so sorry. Do they have a calendar? Do they know when March 22 is and when April 13 is? I'm getting a little ticked off.

Then I see a Speaker sit in the chair who makes a ruling that after two rotations closure can be invoked on that motion. I'm at a loss for that. I don't think I've ever seen in my time at Queen's Park a Speaker ever rule, any Speaker rule, that closure after two rotations was proper, especially on a substantive motion such as this one. That's point number one I'd like clarified. Is that the new rule now set in the province of Ontario, that closure is in vogue any time after two rotations, yes or no? I'd like that explained.

The second thing I'd like explained, please, is that the member for Willowdale was about three or four minutes into his remarks with respect to Bill 102. He then moved an adjournment of the debate, and quite properly in my opinion. I may not be the most unbiased here, but I would think that any reasonable person would have thought that in the first motion called, government notice of motion number 5, debate would have gone on for at least the rest of this evening under normal parliamentary practice, and I'm choosing my words very carefully.

It's not unusual, then, that our critic and that Mr Mahoney, who had the floor, were not here to participate in the debate. The member for Willowdale moved adjournment of the debate on that basis. The debate then resumed and he spoke for some eight or nine minutes. He then moved adjournment of the House. Sorry;



pardon me. He came back and the debate resumed for a few minutes. He moved adjournment of the House. That vote was taken; that vote was lost. We came back and he debated Bill 102 for about eight or nine minutes and then moved adjournment of the debate.

Standing order 45 talks about such motions. It talks about motions to adjourn the House and it talks about motions to adjourn the debate. Standing order 45(b) says, "When a motion for the immediate adjournment of the House has been defeated, no other such motion"—I take it that means another motion to adjourn the House—"shall be made unless some intermediate proceeding has taken place."

The Speaker who was then in the chair—who was a different Speaker, I might add—then ruled that a further motion to adjourn the debate as a dilatory motion was no longer in order because no substantive—I don't want to put words in his mouth, but I believe the rationale was that no substantive intermediate proceeding had taken place.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** Substantive.

**Mr Eves:** Substantive, then, M. Bisson. I wish we were all as perfect as you are.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** That's uncalled for. Be nice.

**Mr Eves:** That was uncalled for. Yes, you're quite correct. I've just straightened that out. Would you let me proceed now? Thank you very much.

I believe that "intermediate proceeding" only refers, in standing order 45(b), to a motion to adjourn the House, not a motion to adjourn the debate.

I understand that there are precedents here that have been set in this place. The second question I'd like to ask of you, sir, Mr Speaker, is, has there ever been a time in the history of the 126 years of the Ontario Legislature where a member of the Legislature, during the same debate, has been permitted to move and was granted more than two dilatory motions?

Because if that is the case, Mr Speaker—and I will do my homework—I'd suggest to you the second Speaker was also in error. We have seen two rather novel, unusual precedents set here this evening.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Parry Sound: First, he will know that regardless of who the occupant of the chair is, the same decisions will be made.

I will address his second point first. The member will know that although the member—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** If the members would show some respect for the chamber and for the Speaker, then indeed I will be pleased to address the points that have been raised. If not, we will continue.

I'd say to the member for Parry Sound, on the second point that he raised, that indeed in other parliaments

when a member indicates that he no longer wishes to debate, when that motion is lost his place is lost in the debate and it goes on to another party. However, in this Parliament we have allowed a subsequent motion to be placed, ie, to move that the House adjourn. The member, then, by moving such a motion, is indicating that the House should rise. That having been defeated, the House has determined that it does not wish to rise; it wishes to continue with the debate. The member then has lost on two motions: one, to adjourn his remarks, and secondly, to adjourn the House for the balance of the sitting.

Having lost on both of those motions, it stands to reason that the member then, if he wishes or she wishes, should continue, with whatever balance of time remains, to make his or her points on the debate. The House should not be entertaining another motion from that particular member to either adjourn the debate or adjourn the House. That's not to say that another member, given the floor, could not move either of those motions. There's no particular difficulty with that.

On the first point that the member raises, indeed the Chair would have recognized that it was a motion to extend the sitting time, not the extended hours, a different debate that this House entertained earlier on to extend the hours to midnight for certain days; that indeed in the view of the Chair sufficient argument had been placed as to why we should or should not sit beyond the prescribed date in the parliamentary calendar of June 24. There is not a particular yardstick with respect to the number of hours, nor the number of speakers who have spoken to the motion, but instead, whether or not in the view of the Chair sufficient time has been allowed for the arguments to be placed either for or against whatever the motion is. In the view of the Chair, there had been sufficient time allotted, and therefore the motion of closure was in order.

I hope that I have answered the member's questions. I understand his concerns full well, but there is certainly nothing out of order, and indeed the chair occupants have done their best, as they will, to try to preserve order and decorum in the chamber and allow orderly debate.

**Mr Elston:** Under the standing orders, we have permitted a member on any piece of business a prescribed amount of time. We have prescribed in the standing orders that the first speaker or critic of any of the three parties will have 90 minutes, and it's within the rules for that person to take 90 minutes.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** We never have.

**Mr Elston:** Oh, you haven't ever? Okay, never do it. We have taken 90 minutes and you guys have taken over an hour in some cases. I agree, you have never gone 90 minutes; you're perfect. But, Mr Speaker, we are allowed to take 90 minutes. They are allowed to take 90 minutes on leadoff. That's the standing order.

Now, whenever the Speaker is in the chair, every successive member can take 30 minutes to speak on business. But when is it that every member of this House is going to be allowed to speak? Because after three days, as you know, under the new rules the New Democratic Party put in here they can move time allocation after three days of debate. That could be in extended hours or in regular hours, which would really mean that at something around six hours of debate they can move time allocation.

2250

Six hours, if everybody uses their allotted time, they cannot go longer, the rules don't permit it, but at what time and under what circumstances is it that you might intervene or one of the others might intervene to ensure that people have at least a portion of their 30-minute time allocation to speak?

Under the current situation, with 129 members now elected here, and excluding yourself who was never able to speak on an issue, 128 people should be allowed to speak on each issue if this place allowed it. There is no time for that to occur, and in fact in the ruling that was just made earlier this evening by your second in charge, two people used their prescribed time from this party, two people used their prescribed time from that party under the standing orders, and there are others of us who wish to speak.

I don't understand why the rules say that the members, excluding the leadoff, can have 30 minutes if we can never get past the second speaker for each party in opposition. There were three speakers for the New Democrats. The third speaker moved closure and that was substantial enough for the Chair to make a decision that two people from each party in opposition was enough to debate while three people could speak for the other party.

Secondly, I was standing and I'd understood that it was within the ambit of members of the opposition to stand on a point of order and advise or make an argument with respect to why the motion being placed at that time was not in order. I was not allowed to make my case. I was told to sit down, and then the Speaker of the time made his decision that enough time had passed without my being able to even get much past my opening remarks.

Mr Speaker, can you tell me why it is that the standing orders don't prescribe that we can only have two speakers on items like that if that's all you're going to allow us to have? Can you tell us why it is, if we are to have more than two speakers, that we are allowed to have an hour and a half for the first speaker and 30 minutes for each subsequent speaker? That's in order, but it is also in order then to preclude the following 32 members of our caucus to be excluded.

What would occur if the independent members had wanted to speak? I wasn't told that they wished to

speak, but I'm advised, in discussions with the other House leaders and yourself, that they are allowed to have a place in rotation when they indicate that they wish to speak on matters. That would mean that we would have two speakers, the Progressive Conservatives would have two speakers and each of the independents, if they chose or if they elected, would have half an hour to speak to an item.

I don't find that to be rational or reasonable. It seems that the standing orders contemplate that more than two people should be able to speak on any particular item. It seems that they provide us with time to speak, and in fact, as long as we work within the rules, it seems to me that you, or whoever is in the Chair at the time, should make sure that more than two people can speak on each item. Otherwise, the 90-minute and 30-minute subsequent allocations for members to speak are absolutely meaningless.

If it really is being said that two hours' debate from this caucus and two hours from the opposition is sufficient, we would have to divide our two-hour time among 34 people, 35 people, whatever it is, it doesn't matter. It doesn't divide evenly anyway, so it's going to be a tough exercise. How is it then that we are to realize how to order our business if but two people can speak and they speak inside the standing orders allocation?

That's my concern. I would like to hear some direction on that.

**The Speaker:** The member for Bruce, first I wish to address this point and there were two parts. Number one, a motion for closure is not debatable and the member will know that.

**Mr Elston:** No, but you can tell us if it's in order.

**The Speaker:** At a time when Parliament had no restrictions with respect to the length of individual members' speeches, there was never a guarantee that all members would have an opportunity to participate. At the same time, on the other end of the scale, neither is there a prescribed minimum number of speakers, nor a maximum.

**Mr Elston:** No, there is a maximum.

**The Speaker:** What has to be judged by the—

**Mr Elston:** There is a maximum. You can only have 129 people.

**The Speaker:** Well, the maximum would be 129 people. But the balance for the Chair is to determine whether or not the motion which is on the floor has had sufficient debate before allowing the motion for closure, and if the Chair determines that indeed there has been sufficient debate, then the motion for closure is in order. If there hasn't been sufficient time, in the view of the Chair, the motion for closure is not in order. But the motion having been placed is not debatable and must immediately be voted upon.



**Mr Elston:** I didn't say it was debatable. I just asked whether it's in order.

**The Speaker:** In closing, I understand full well the member for Bruce's point, and indeed in the best of all worlds one would want to have every member of the assembly debating every issue. Parliament has never allowed that. Although the possibility is there, rarely is there ever that kind of opportunity that is permitted, nor has it been.

A new point of order?

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Mr Speaker, I hope that the table officers, the Clerk and yourself and your predecessors in the Chair appreciate the frustration experienced by members of the opposition. You are there in accordance with parliamentary tradition and in accordance with our standing orders, to protect minority rights in this Legislature. We are the minority.

I have for the last two weeks been prepared to speak on a number of pieces of government business, which I must add it's been very difficult to prepare because the order of government business keeps changing and we don't get a lot of warning, as was the case with the pay equity bill tonight that Mr Harnick had to speak on. But the fact of the matter is, I've not had the opportunity to speak.

I thought, Mr Speaker, and I would appreciate your comments on this, that when the government sold the bill of goods to the public and put a gun to our heads and brought us into this era of time allocation, half-hour speeches only for members except the first speaker of each party, who gets 90 minutes on any bill, the intent there was to allow all members an opportunity to speak.

Now, you say there are no minimums, there are no maximums, but, Mr Speaker, I think that the table officers and yourself are in the old mindset. You're in the mindset when we weren't time-allocated in terms of our length of speeches.

Tonight the member for Willowdale was not allowed to introduce a third dilatory motion because only nine minutes had elapsed since the vote on the second dilatory motion. Well, when you only have a half-hour in total to make your remarks, nine minutes should be considered substantive. Nine minutes is all he could squeeze in between dilatory motions.

We've seen, I think, two unprecedented rulings tonight, first on the closure motion and second on not allowing the third dilatory motion by the member for Willowdale. Mr Speaker, I just wonder if the mindset of your rulings and your predecessors' rulings in the chair tonight has adjusted to accommodate the fact that we have a gun to our heads all the time in this Legislature.

This isn't the good old days of Peter Kormos and 17 hours' debate that put that party on the map. His 17 hours of debate put the NDP on the map and entrenched in the minds of Ontarians the fact that they really

believed in something, because they got to get up and debate it for 17 hours straight.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to represent our constituents. I've waited two weeks to speak in this chamber. I've not been allowed to do it. We've got a gun to our head by the House leader. We've got table officers who are in cahoots with the Speaker and the government.

I only ask that the new era of limited debates be considered in rulings, because I don't think you're respecting tradition even when there is unlimited debate, and I certainly don't think that the precedents that are being set reflect the reality that we, as members of the opposition, the minority in this Parliament, have an opportunity to speak, given that we have a gun to our heads all the time. Mr Speaker, you know it's almost impossible to get your constituents' concerns on the record in a half-hour debate. You get four or five constituency letters written out if you're lucky.

I only ask that in future rulings, and when you're reviewing these rulings—because I hope you stay up all night, and your predecessors do, because I think they were frankly immoral rulings; I don't think they were constant with tradition of this House—I only ask that you consider our concerns, our very real concerns, and give consideration to future rulings in light of the fact that we have a gun to our heads all the time and we're not allowed to participate in our parliamentary democracy as I was elected to do on behalf of my constituents.

2300

**The Speaker:** The government House leader, on the same point.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'd like to address both the point that the last member has raised and the points that were raised by the two House leaders opposite, because I think they're extremely important points that have been raised, and it's important for us to understand exactly why they've been raised.

The House leader for the third party raised the question of this two-rotation issue and only four people speaking on a routine motion. We should point out that the standing orders in this House very clearly set out our feeling about routine motions. The standing orders set out two hours for debate on the motion to sit late hours for the last two weeks of the session. We also set out in the standing orders that the debate on a time allocation motion, for example, which is another routine motion, is to take one sessional day, or roughly two and a half hours, Mr Speaker, as you're aware, in terms of a normal sessional day. We were debating a routine motion this afternoon, and I think the Chair, who was asked to make the ruling at the time, made a very appropriate ruling.

The other complaint that's being raised here by both

the House leader for the opposition party—and I think he demonstrated a very clear dislike for the standing orders in his comments, but I don't think there was really a point of order in his comments; he was expressing a dislike for the current standing orders, which do allow some things and don't allow some other things—but the major complaint that seems to be being put to you, Mr Speaker, is about a lack of time for members opposite to debate substantive matters here in the House, and I should point out to you, Mr Speaker, that this evening, through actions of the opposition, we've wasted precisely one and a half hours of time that could have been used to debate substantive matters.

**The Speaker:** On the same point, and I hope not repetitive, the member for Willowdale.

**Mr Harnick:** First, let me say in response to what the government House leader said, there was nothing routine about the motion that was brought.

The motion that was brought was to sit in the summer. We have a calendar here that says what's routine, and the routine is that we have a fixed period to sit. If the government can't get its act together and operate on that calendar and start in March when it's supposed to start and ends up missing six weeks of the calendar, to bring a motion now and force closure is anything but routine. That's the first thing.

The second thing, Mr Speaker, and I do hope you'll grant me the indulgence of listening to—may I have your indulgence, Mr Speaker? It's very difficult, with respect, for me to make points on a point of order when you're talking to someone else and trying to give me the impression that you're listening to the submissions I'm making, with respect.

The other thing that has happened here tonight, and I don't know if the Speaker has realized the precedent that has been set here, but tonight a time allocation motion became a thing of the past. It's obsolete. The government will never have to bring a time allocation motion in this place again. The reason they don't have to do that is, why bring a time allocation motion where you have to have a debate when you can bring a closure motion after two rotations and that's the end of it? Why do you have to bring a motion and have three days of debate when you can have two rotations from the Liberal Party and two rotations from the Conservative Party and then you can bring the closure motion?

I don't know if that point has gone right over everyone's head, but quite honestly, this is a very significant event that's gone on here. I think that if the Speaker does not rule on this issue, that is the precedent that will be created. We don't need time allocation any more; we don't need three days of debate; all we need are two rotations and we bring in closure and that's the end.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Next they won't even bother

calling Parliament.

**Mrs Marland:** There is no honour.

**Mr Harnick:** The honour and respect that members have for this place diminish by the moment as a result of those kinds of precedents.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Simcoe West, I understand full well what he has expressed. Indeed, not just the members of the opposition but often backbench government members wish an opportunity to participate in every item that's brought before the House. I fully understand that and appreciate it.

To the government House leader, indeed I understand his point about the amount of time that is normally utilized with respect to a time allocation motion or the motion to extend the sitting hours.

To the member for Willowdale, there isn't any particular point in revisiting the decision which was made. But suffice it to say, as I did earlier on, that it is not the amount of time, nor is it the number of people who have spoken to the motion, but rather if, in the view of the Chair, sufficient debate has been allowed for that particular motion. A different motion brought forward may involve a different amount of time if, in the view of the Chair, a different amount of time is required, either more or less than the one previous. There is not a particular rule that describes the number of speakers or the amount of time that should elapse before closure can properly be placed. It doesn't work that way.

Where we are at right now is that the member for Willowdale has completed his remarks, and we will entertain questions and/or comments.

**Mrs Marland:** On a point of order.

**The Speaker:** A brand-new point of order? The member for Mississauga South.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I have only been in this House for eight years. I realize there are a few members, very few in this House tonight who have been in this House more than eight years. It so happens—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs Marland:** You see what I mean, Mr Speaker? I cannot even rise in my place and make a serious statement without the government members sneering and catcalling across the floor. It's a very immature response.

**The Speaker:** If the member for Mississauga South has a point of order, could she place it through the Chair, please.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I wish to speak to you, and I speak to you as someone who has been a member of this assembly for eight years. I will tell you with some emotion that I hope I never spend another sitting in this House the way we have experienced the actions and the events of this evening. I say that with the



deepest respect for this chamber and I say it with the deepest respect for the Chair and the table officers.

What we have had tonight, starting with a rush up the steps to the top step where the Chair presides, albeit an apology succeeding, albeit by more than one whip of one party, but what I witnessed tonight was an absolute physical charge on the Speaker in front of his chair, to the point that he teetered back and almost lost his balance. I honestly, sitting here watching it, could not believe what was taking place. I was upset because of the fact that I realized what I was witnessing was a breakdown in the total respect for this chamber.

**2310**

If this place is going to be reduced to something hardly better than a zoo, I feel that I do not wish to be part of it. I say with all sincerity that if we are going to continue with the business of this province, and I think all of us as elected representatives in this province have an obligation to deal with the business in this House, there is a procedure by which to proceed with that business, and as far as I know it is still the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

I realize now, especially when I see standing order 45(b), which says, "When a motion for the immediate adjournment of the House has been defeated, no other such motion shall be made unless some intermediate proceeding has taken place," it's very clear that we need an interpretation from you as to what 45(b) will mean from this day forward. Our whole operation in this House pivots around the interpretation of these rules. We have a precedent in a motion tonight that clearly supersedes these rules, and if we have a precedent that is interpreted by the Chair, by the Speaker, then we have to know whether that will stand or whether it was a fluke of an event that took place this evening among some heated feelings on both sides of the House.

Mr Speaker, I respectfully ask you tomorrow to come back, when you have considered what took place here tonight, with some kind of ruling that will help us to restore the professionalism and the demeanour of this House which this chamber is due.

**The Speaker:** To the honourable member for Mississauga South, I know her deep feelings about the decorum in this chamber and I appreciate the way she has expressed her concern. She is absolutely right that if the members do not respect the Chair, then we cannot conduct business properly. It's as simple as that.

I'm not sure of how much help I can be to the member, but I will try. The members must remember that if a member has moved to adjourn the debate, the member is indicating that he or she no longer wishes to debate. The House then will decide whether or not that is something the House will accept. When the member then decides to adjourn the House, the message is that this House should no longer sit for the balance of this day. The House then will decide whether or not that is

what the House wishes to do.

The question then comes about the intervening proceeding, and, in the view of the Chair then, if that proceeding is something substantive, sufficient to warrant another motion. That's very difficult to determine. As with the former episode I described, there is not a set rule that says you need X number of people to speak or a certain amount of time to have elapsed. That's not the way in which you can judge these matters, and the same will be with respect to what had occurred on the previous ruling.

However, rather than occupy the balance of the time of the House on this matter, I take what the member has said very seriously and I will endeavour to see if there is some way in which I can be of assistance to the member and indeed to the House. But at this time I would suggest that we have exhausted the topic and we should be on to questions and/or comments.

**Mr Harnick:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** A point of order, and I trust this is a brand-new point of order.

**Mr Harnick:** Well, no, it's a point of order to correct a misstatement of the standing orders. When you say that you are going to look into whether there is something intervening or whether there's something substantive, that clearly is not what the rule says. The words of import are "intermediate proceeding," whether an "intermediate proceeding has taken place." It doesn't say "intervening," it doesn't say "substantive;" it says "intermediate proceeding."

I submit to you that "intermediate" is some point in time where some event takes place; it's not the beginning and it's not the end; it's intermediate, it's in the middle. If something happens in the middle, if there's a proceeding in the middle, I submit to you that that is what the substance of this rule says. It doesn't say "substantive" and it doesn't say—

**The Speaker:** I realize that the honourable member for Willowdale was simply trying to be instructive and not trying to be seen as debating the Speaker's ruling. Questions and/or comments? The member for Scarborough Centre, with up to two minutes.

**Mr Owens:** It gives me great pleasure to respond to the member for Willowdale. Two things are very clear from his debate. First of all, he's not interested in dealing with Bill 102, as he has tried consistently to adjourn this House. I think as you pointed out just seconds ago, Mr Speaker, a person who is moving adjournment of the debate clearly is not interested in speaking on the debate. If the member for Willowdale was interested in knowing anything about this bill he would know that over 420,000 women will be affected in a positive manner with respect to this legislation.

The thing that truly concerns me about the comments that came from the preserve of Jurassic Park across the

way was the backlash argument that was articulated by the member for Willowdale, quoting from a journalist indicating that pay equity will cause job loss. If this member knew absolutely anything about how pay equity plans were negotiated, who was involved in the negotiation and how pay equity plans were implemented, he would know the kinds of steps that would be taken to eliminate any kind of job loss.

In terms of the lowering of wages, again, it's a Tory argument, and it's clear what they support: a free trade agreement, the North American free trade agreement; that they're only interested in the lowest common denominator. They're not interested in bringing people up to a place of equality.

For 42 years this party governed the province of Ontario, during times that they are constantly reminding us were times of prosperity. So where were they with their pay equity legislation? Where were they in terms of their interest in fairness? They were nowhere. They were still trying to cast the movie Jurassic Park.

**Mr Elston:** The material which was read into the record by the member for Willowdale was just a portion of the material that he would have presented had he been able to do his full statement. I think that it's important for us to understand that during his remarks he lost between 10 and 15 minutes, and basically the Speaker in the chair was saying, "We don't care, because you made the motion, and as a result of your motion we're going to penalize you the time."

I just want to note for the record that I think the remarks of the member could have been much more fully expressed in a more meaningful manner if it had not been for the fact that this item was somewhat of a surprise for us this evening and if it had not been for the fact that he was being baited and interrupted on several occasions during the course of his comments.

Whether or not, Mr Speaker, as you have decided, he was indicating he wanted to give up the floor by moving adjournment of the debate or of the House I think is pretty debatable, because his moves to do both of those were to indicate, firstly, that he was taking over from a previous speaker who was inadvertently away from the House when this motion was called, and secondly, he wanted to adjourn when he was being baited by members of the opposition. That, it seems to me, was a clear indication that the member was not willingly giving any sense that he was going to give way his right to speak on the floor, but it was something of an expression of frustration that the government was not willing to listen to his quotations of the material which he was presenting.

I merely state that to explain more fully to the audience that the two motions which he made were not any indication that he didn't wish to speak, and I thought it should be necessary to clarify in relation to my reading of his motions.

It is also quite interesting to note that the articles which he read would have been of much greater interest had he been able to read them without being baited by several people in this chamber. It would have been a much more complete debate had there been an allocation of his 30 minutes. It looked like the previous Speaker in the chair was indicating that a punishment was being exacted on him for even making a motion which he felt at the time was in order.

2320

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** It gives me great pleasure to be able to comment on the speech by—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I thought it was in rotation.

**The Speaker:** There's nothing out of order. If the member for Etobicoke West would just take his seat and calm down. There are four people who are permitted to have up to two minutes and the Chair will try to find a balance. It doesn't matter particularly in which order you go, provided we have four people and we have a balance.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Just relax. I think the honourable member for Simcoe West knows that he will be recognized.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** There is nothing out of order. The member must take his seat. The member for Ottawa Centre with up to two minutes.

**Mr Stockwell:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. Point of order. Point of order.

**The Speaker:** If the member for Etobicoke West refuses to come to order he will be named.

**Mr Stockwell:** Point of privilege, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** No, the member will take his seat. I had recognized the member for Ottawa Centre. She has two minutes for her reply and then we will move on to another person.

**Mr Stockwell:** What if a Liberal stands up? Will you go there?

**The Speaker:** Just relax. We will have a balance of opportunity.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I consider it a great privilege to be allowed to speak for two minutes in response to the comments by the member for Willowdale on Bill 102, which extends pay equity in this province. This bill is the culmination of years of work.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: She is not speaking to the bill, she speaks and asks questions or makes comments to the speech by the member for Willowdale. She cannot speak on her own.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: How did he get a point of order?



*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** The member for Ottawa Centre with her questions and/or comments.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Mr Speaker, do you think it's possible that the clock might be set back so that I might have two minutes?

I wish to say it is my great pleasure, having participated in the first debates on pay equity in this Legislature, to be able to respond to the member for Willowdale, whose party never introduced pay equity, did not support pay equity when it was introduced first under the accord in 1986 when the Liberals were the government and the NDP asked that that government, in order to have our support, move forward with pay equity. This bill marks the extension of a regime, an approach to the place of women working in Ontario which has never been supported by the Conservative Party.

That is why the member for Willowdale in 1993 will use such phrases as "artificial mechanisms to achieve pay equity." Does he think that without some very carefully constructed mechanism we would ever see fair pay for women in this province?

**The Speaker:** The member for Simcoe West.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order.

**The Speaker:** What is the point of order?

**Mr Stockwell:** If we were in rotation, as it's supposed to be in this place, where we go from the government to the official opposition to the third party, you were then supposed to have called the third party in order. You went to the government side, Mr Speaker, by mistake, and now you're obligated, in rotation, to go to the official opposition. Can't you see the error, Mr Speaker?

**The Speaker:** To the member for Etobicoke West, there is nothing out of order. There is no prescribed rotation within the standing orders. The member will know that what the Chair always tries to do is to provide a balance. The person who was speaking, who had the floor for the debate, was a member from the third party; two members from the government side have had an opportunity and one member from the official opposition, and I have just recognized the member for Simcoe West, who is from the third party, and then the member who originally spoke will have two minutes to wrap up. That is balance. The member for Simcoe West.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think the problem here is that we're rather confused as to what is contained in the standing orders. You say there's nothing prescribed in the standing orders with respect to rotation but, with respect to tradition, rotation at one time was adhered to.

I do want to talk about the pay equity bill, though, and I want to say to the member for Scarborough Centre

that I think it's rather hypocritical of the government to talk about fairness, talk about equity, when we know that the onus of implementing pay equity and the costs involved are primarily thrust upon the private sector, and when Bill 169—we had union demonstrators in the galleries not too long ago opposed to that legislation—allows the government to exempt large blocks of public sector employees from pay equity itself, yet they thrust their social engineering on to the private sector, no holds barred.

Pay equity would be good if women in this province had equal pay for work of equal value or equal work, but that's not exactly what pay equity is, and I find that my constituents get confused. "Pay equity" was a term actually made up by a journalist some years ago and it stuck to a social theory that really has very little to do with equity. I want to give an example in the 40 seconds.

I have two constituency assistants in my office, one male, one female. Pay equity was brought in and the female got a \$1,500-per-annum raise and the male got nothing. You tell me what is equal or where the equity is in that: doing the same job, the same job description, started at approximately the same time in my office, but one is a male and one is a female. I want to say to Jeff Nathin, my constituency assistant, that I have no explanation why he was discriminated against by this government and its social theory engineering. I have no explanation for my constituency assistant.

**The Speaker:** The member for Willowdale has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Harnick:** Let me tell the member for Ottawa Centre that the first pay equity plan that came to this place was introduced by the Progressive Conservative Party to ensure equal pay among women and men in the boards of education across this province. I know that the member for Ottawa Centre thinks she's the only person who can do anything good for any person in this province. But let me tell you, her party was not the first to do anything about pay equity in this province. That's the first thing.

The second thing: The member for Ottawa Centre takes great pride in talking about all her accomplishments while she's been in government. Well, I remind the member for Ottawa Centre that in the most recent by-elections, her party had trouble getting 8% of the vote, and if she had to run in an election today on the abysmal record of this government, she wouldn't win 10 seats in this province today, and she knows it. On her record, the only thing she would get is people throwing stones at her.

The other thing I wanted to say very briefly is that you on the other side just don't understand. Right now, women between the ages of 15 and 24 are making 83% in income of that of a man, and that's without any pay equity plan at all. When this pay equity plan is intro-

duced and those young people lose their jobs, when they lose their jobs because pay equity is introduced and employers can't afford it, those average numbers are going to end up going down, not going up, because you're trying to do this in the height of a recession, a recession that this government is doing nothing positive to bring us out of.

2330

**The Speaker:** I thank the member for Willowdale for his participation in the debate.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Throughout the comments of the member for Willowdale, the Treasurer was heckling me. I simply say to him that if he has a problem with my comments on pay equity, call an election. I'll go to the polls on this issue or any other issue you've adopted.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. All members, including the member for Nickel Belt, realize that interjections are out of order. Is there further debate on this bill?

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** I'm pleased to join in this debate on Bill 102, even as we approach the midnight hour. I'm especially pleased because back in 1988 when the pay equity legislation was passed and was being implemented—that pay equity legislation, I might remind the House, was initiated pursuant to the Liberal-NDP accord in 1985. In any event, in 1988, when that pay equity legislation was being implemented, there was a series of conferences to educate the public right across Ontario. We had a conference in London, attended by at least 300 people. I chaired a workshop at that conference on pay equity.

At that time there were many people who came forward: people who worked in women's shelters, for example, people who worked in child care facilities, women who were homemakers, women who were community mental health workers, women who worked for immigrant services, women who worked in native friendship centres, women who worked in libraries, women who worked in community corrections programs, women who worked in Alzheimer's programs, just for example. There were many women who were excluded from the ambit of the pay equity legislation simply for lack of appropriate comparators.

I'm very pleased that the questions of the women who came forward back in 1988 and since that time have been answered in Bill 102, which reflects this government's commitment to pay equity and extending pay equity to recognize that women's work, in whatever sector, must be paid for fairly. This basic right of women to fair, equitable and non-discriminatory rates of pay is reflected in Bill 102, which redresses wage discrimination for many women who are among the lowest level of wage earners.

Quite frankly, at the committee hearings on Bill 102,

many of these groups again came forward to say how pleased they were with the introduction of Bill 102 and urged its speedy passing.

For example, the Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses, that with all other female-predominant sectors has waited anxiously for an opportunity to achieve equitable wages for the dedicated women they represent, had this to say: "We believe that the continued existence of shelters for abused women and their children has been made possible by our members' willingness to work for low wages, as they put their belief in women's rights to a life free of violence and persecution ahead of their own rights to equitable pay. We believe that the recognition of this dedication through the achievement of pay equity is long overdue."

The Union of Child Care Workers of Eastern Ontario drew a similar conclusion, and what it said was this:

"We want to thank you for providing us the opportunity of presenting our recommendations because Bill 102 is very important to the child care community. It finally allows us to feel that we are included in the right to fair and decent wages that are not based on our gender. This is an equally important recognition for our profession.

"But the direct operating grant and the wage enhancement grant were two important steps by the government to increase the salaries and benefits of people working in the child care field. The wage gap still remains. The importance of public funding continues to play a critical role in striving to achieve equity.

"Escalating parent fees alone cannot pay for better salaries and benefits. For us, as front-line workers," they say, "pay equity is complementary and integral to other initiatives such as child care reform and employment equity."

Earlier this year, as down payments on pay equity for a variety of these sectors, for over 50,000 workers, cheques were sent out, as a down payment towards pay equity to show this government's commitment towards extending pay equity to these low-paid, predominantly female sectors of the workforce. I think this speaks to this government's commitment to seeing through the extension of pay equity to the over 420,000 women who were left out in 1988.

We've heard at some length discussion with respect to the proxy method of achieving pay equity, with respect to the proportional value approach to achieving pay equity, and now, after seven hours of debate on third reading of this bill—I might add that aside from the introduction of the member for Sudbury, which lasted some 10 minutes or so, and my own remarks tonight, other than time intervals allowed for questions and comments, seven hours of debate has unfolded upon third reading of the bill, and pursuant to standing order



47, I would ask that the question now be put.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We leave it in your hands. You've already told us you've got to consider the fact whether or not sufficient debate has occurred on whatever reading. We can't debate on first reading, obviously. We have no longer, it appears, any time to debate on second reading, except that it's time-allocated. In fact, if you examine the record, there was virtually no second reading debate on this particular bill. It went into committee. This is third reading.

Mr Speaker, we are obviously in your hands. This is the second time tonight, within three hours, that these birds have moved closure on items in this House. What can we do?

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Mr Speaker, I believe that in terms of moving closure during this period of our Legislature, I think it's quite inappropriate. For instance, I have not had the opportunity to hear much of the debate on this bill, because we are sitting in the evenings and I was required to go back to my riding this evening to celebrate the award of a citizenship of the year for Phil Downey for the township of West Carleton.

Mr Speaker, I don't think that you should accept a short debate on any bill, because the government has extended the hours and members have to go back to their ridings. If it's seven hours as they claim during regular debate, during normal sittings of the House—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Third reading.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Sterling:** —you should require twice as much debate at this time.

We know now we're going to sit next week and the week thereafter. It was the government's option to put us into these late hours. Members of this Legislature do not have the opportunity to spend the time in this Legislature they would normally do, and therefore I don't think the normal rules or the normal traditions of this House in terms of moving closure should hold, not during this period of time.

Therefore, I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to indulge the House and allow more speakers to speak on this particular bill.

2340

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** Mr Speaker, I rise to speak on that point of order. I've sat here somewhat quietly through the debate this evening. I would think that at the very least, a sense of the order of this House would not have led the honourable member to move the motion that he did, given what has happened. As the Treasurer says, third reading, but I say to the Treasurer, go back to the Hansard. There was no debate on second reading worth the name of a debate, and that was done in December through agreement. Go back to December

9 and 10. Ask the former House leader. By agreement, there was a limited debate.

We came in tonight. My colleague from Mississauga, who was not here, who had been speaking on the debate and who would have continued, was not allowed to speak, not because he didn't want to speak but simply because you moved closure. After all that has happened this evening, to then invoke closure is ridiculous, and I would suggest it is undemocratic, because you are cutting off the debate on this issue. No one has spoken because of what has gone on, when we go back to the beginning of all the mess that started when you moved closure.

Mr Speaker, I suggest that you look at what has happened tonight, that you look at the actual debate that has taken place on this bill and that you say we cannot have closure on this bill.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** The members opposite have just very clearly made the case for what is happening tonight.

This is a bill around which there was a very short and orderly debate on second reading, without closure, without time allocation, without anything. It was also a very short and orderly set of hearings and clause-by-clause in committee that lasted for two weeks.

The third reading debate on this bill started some three weeks ago, not tonight, to speak to the point that was raised by the member for Ottawa-Carleton. This bill has been debated on two afternoons in this House during the regular session. We called it tonight, as you're well aware, Mr Speaker, fairly early in the evening and have been here at it all evening. There hasn't been a lot of debate on the bill, though, tonight, because the opposition has decided that they intend to use this bill as an additional delaying tactic to slow progress in this House.

This is a bill that on third reading should have passed, and passed without virtual comment.

**Mr Beer:** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: He is impugning motive and that is not allowable. I ask the honourable member to withdraw those comments.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** This is a bill that should have found its way through the process.

**Mr Beer:** You're impugning the motives of the members of the opposition. I ask the government House leader to take his seat and then to apologize.

**The Speaker:** The member for York North is normally quite in control. I understand why you are concerned. I would ask the government House leader, in placing his points, not to impute motives at all but simply to provide whatever facts he feels will guide the Chair.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Precisely right, Mr Speaker, seven hours of debate on second reading, two weeks in committee—

**Mr Beer:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe that under the rules of this House, the honourable member should withdraw the comment.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** You haven't been recognized.

**The Speaker:** It would appear that the government House leader's comments are the cause of disorder in the House and I would ask the member then to—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** It obviously has caused a stir on this side, and I would ask the member if he would just withdraw that particular remark.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I certainly withdraw whatever remark it was that has upset the member opposite.

The point, Mr Speaker, is that we had seven hours of debate on second reading on this bill—

**Mr Elston:** On second?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** On second reading we had seven hours of debate. You may check the record.

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** On third; none on second.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Charlton:** We had seven hours of debate on two days in this House on second reading. Check the record. We also had two weeks of hearings and clause-by-clause and we've had an additional—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Beer:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The debate on second reading was on two bills. It was not on one bill and it was on two bills through all-party agreement.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Which was the crux of my remarks.

**Mr Beer:** I have here the Hansard if somebody wants to look at it.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Hey, Floyd, listen to this, you might learn something.

**The Speaker:** The member for Simcoe West, please come to order.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I can only hear one point of order at a time. The member for York North, could he be succinct?

**Mr Beer:** Mr Speaker, I'll be very succinct and very brief, but I just want to inform the government House leader that by all-party agreement, December 9 and 10, two bills were debated. I don't question that it may have been seven hours, but there were two bills. So there has not been seven hours of debate on Bill 102. I note the parliamentary assistant nodding her head and I appreciate that.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The point I've been trying to make—that's precisely the point the government House leader has been trying to make, Mr Speaker, that the

opposition in its view of this bill dealt with second reading and committee in a very orderly fashion. I'll leave it to your judgement but we've had seven hours of debate on third reading of this bill—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Charlton:** On this bill we have had seven hours of debate on third reading. The opposition has made it clear here this evening, from a number of initiatives they've taken, that they don't wish to debate the bill any further, so we've asked that the question be put.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I think what is continuing to happen in this House is truly deplorable. We have had two closure motions—I have been here all evening—we've had two closure—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs Marland:** For the benefit of the government members, the reason I'm confirming that I have been in this House all evening is not—I am not complaining about being in this House all evening, I'm simply saying that I have been in this House all evening and I am fully aware of the motions that have been made in this House this evening.

We have had two closure motions tonight. In one evening we've had two closure motions and, Mr Speaker, what I would like to suggest to you is that the member for London South moved a closure motion after he had spoken for approximately seven minutes and 15 seconds.

What I would like to know, because I think this is going to be very significant, is whether we now have an example of some intermediate proceeding. If you accept his closure motion after seven minutes and 15 seconds of debate, then is that now the benchmark for intermediate proceedings?

2350

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. First of all, I appreciate the points raised by a number of members, including the member for Carleton, the member for Bruce, the government House leader, the member for York North and the member for Mississauga South.

Indeed, as members will know, it is not the precise amount of time that has been utilized. But I can tell members that on various occasions, before closure was moved, we have utilized in one case 10 hours; on another five hours; another two hours and 29 minutes; three hours and three minutes; 49 hours and 35 minutes; eight hours and 15 minutes.

The point is that it is not in particular the amount of time that has been utilized but whether or not under the circumstances there has been sufficient debate on the motion before the House to allow closure. It is my



belief and my decision that in this particular instance we have not utilized a sufficient amount of time and I will not allow the motion for closure to be placed. I would ask the honourable member for London South to continue with his remarks.

**Mr Winner:** I think we've come a long way with Bill 102 and I think that the members of the opposition are treading on very dangerous ground here if they choose to look again at some of the comments that have been made by some of the deputants before our committee. As I said, there were a number of groups that came before us, each making a submission calling for expedition of this legislation, for example, the Nurses Coalition for Pay Equity. That coalition came before the standing committee on administration of justice and had this to say:

"As nurses we embody all which is typical of women's work. We carry enormous responsibility for outcomes that we cannot ensure. We work long hours in often dangerous circumstances, and our work is only noticed when it is done badly, or not done at all. Our work is underrecognized, our contribution to the health of the public is unseen and we are undervalued."

What the opposition is doing tonight is prolonging that feeling of the nurses of being undervalued in failing to allow Bill 102 to pass in a timely and expeditious fashion.

The Nurses Coalition for Pay Equity went on to say:

"These amendments set a new legislative precedent and go far beyond what previous governments in the province were prepared to achieve. We have observed the progress made by this government on other issues of social justice and believe that it is committed to ensuring the rights of women and other underserved groups. We are pleased that the government is making the necessary changes to the Pay Equity Act in order to provide for the thousands of women who are not covered by current legislation."

We've heard from women who work in the child care sector. We've heard from women who work for shelters for abused women. We've heard from the nurses. Here are some other comments, made by the Metro Toronto Coalition for Better Child Care. I know there are some members from the Toronto area in the House tonight sitting opposite who may want to reflect on the comments of the Metro coalition. The Metro coalition represents child care staff whose members earn, and they are among the higher-paid workers in the non-profit child care sector, an average salary of \$25,000.

They say, "We recognize that our wages are better than most child care staff in Ontario, who earn an average of only \$22,000 a year." However, even at \$25,000, these women recognize that: "We cannot survive on these wages. As a predominantly female

sector, we earn 70% of the wages that men earn."

They go on to say:

"We want to applaud the provincial government for making amendments to the Pay Equity Act, which will extend pay equity to most workers in predominantly female workplaces like child care programs. The amendments will begin to address the wage inequities women face in the workforce."

The Metro Toronto Coalition for Better Child Care goes on to say:

"Wages and working conditions of staff working in the municipal sector have served as a benchmark for wages in non-profit community programs. The work performed in both settings is identical. Child care staff in both groups strive to provide a holistic and balanced social and educational program to young children. The only difference between the two groups is municipal staff have better wages and better benefits. Consequently, staff in municipally operated programs remain in the child care field for longer periods of time and are able to provide consistent care for children. In the non-profit sector," they say, "we face a higher turnover as experienced child care staff move to other careers which pay a living wage."

Finally, the coalition concludes:

"We believe strongly that the implementation of pay equity for child care staff in the non-profit sector will improve the quality of care the children receive, because better wages for staff is a major indicator of quality in child care. Staff which earn a decent wage are more likely to remain in the field of child care."

Not only is the opposition tonight holding back, in a very deliberate way, the extension of pay equity to women in the lower-paid sectors; this will also impact on child care. I hope that their constituents remain cognizant of that.

Our government undertook a major initiative with regard to reform of the child care system. Under our former Minister of Community and Social Services, the Honourable Marion Boyd, we have sought to make that child care system more accessible, more affordable and to ensure quality of child care for people across Ontario.

Unfortunately, if we're going to deliver that kind of quality child care, we need to assure ourselves that our child care workers in the non-profit sector are receiving appropriate wages for the very important work they do with the children of this province. It frightens me that the opposition tonight would choose to prolong debate on this bill after a very adequate, in my submission, period of time, and not only set back our initiative with regard to pay equity for over 420,000 women who, I trust, will remember this night, but also set back the initiatives with regard to child care.

**The Speaker:** Point of order, the member for St Catharines.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My point of order is this, Mr Speaker: Would the honourable member tell us where the money is to implement this bill?

**The Speaker:** No. That's questions and comments. The member for London South.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the member for Downsview allow his own colleague to speak.

**Mr Winner:** I can't imagine why the member would ask that question, because if he had listened earlier, he would have heard the fact that down payments on pay equity have already been made in substantial numbers. I said over 50,000 workers in these sectors that I've referred to have benefited from our down payment on pay equity, a substantial payment of \$2,500.

I know that the child care workers and women who work in shelters for the abused in my community are quite thankful and quite grateful that these down payment cheques have been sent out, because that speaks to a more meaningful commitment to pay equity for these women than the Liberal government was prepared to afford them, and certainly far more substantial than what the Conservative government ever dreamed up.

**The Speaker:** This may come as a great disappointment to all, but, it being 12 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 of the clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 2402.





# CONTENTS

Wednesday 23 June 1993

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION

**Meetings of the house,** government  
notice of motion number 5

Mr Carr	1883
Ms Murdock	1898
Mr Callahan	1899
Mr McLean	1904
Mr Cooke	1907
Mr Elston	1908

## THIRD READINGS

**Pay Equity Amendment Act, 1993,**  
Bill 102

Mr Harnick	1910, 1922
Mr Owens	1919
Mr Elston	1920
Ms Gigantes	1920
Mr Winninger	1922, 1925



No. 38A



N° 38A

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 24 June 1993

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

## Journal des débats (Hansard)

Jeudi 24 juin 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Thursday 24 June 1993

The House met at 1001.

Prayers.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT  
(SEXUAL ORIENTATION), 1993**

**LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LE CODE DES DROITS  
DE LA PERSONNE (ORIENTATION SEXUELLE)**

Mr Murphy moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 45, An Act to amend the Human Rights Code with respect to Sexual Orientation / Loi modifiant le Code des droits de la personne en ce qui concerne l'orientation sexuelle.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** The honourable member for St George-St David will have 10 minutes to open up debate, after which every recognized political party in the Legislature will have up to 15 minutes to participate in the debate, after which the honourable member will have two minutes in summation. Mr Murphy has up to 10 minutes.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I'm proud to be able to rise in the House today to speak on this bill.

I notice in the House the member for Ottawa Centre. It seems that progress on the issue of rights for gays and lesbians in our society seems to start always with motions by members from the opposition, and I'm proud to be able to continue on the tradition of the member for Ottawa Centre, who moved in committee, I guess it was seven years ago, the amendment at that time to the Human Rights Code to add sexual orientation to parts of the Human Rights Code. I am proud to be able to continue in that tradition by further amending the Human Rights Code in two respects.

The first I think relates to what is probably an oversight in the Human Rights Code, which was that sexual orientation be added as a prohibited ground of discrimination in the harassment provisions of the Human Rights Code.

The second and more important change, I believe, is to take the words "of the opposite sex" out of the definition of "marital status." That will have the effect of advancing the cause of gay and lesbian rights in this province by extending, among other things, benefits into the private sector.

This bill builds on the decision of the human rights tribunal in the Leshner decision, which concluded that the failure to provide benefits to the same-sex partners of employees was discrimination under the charter and that the code contravened the charter because of its failure to provide for it. This is intended to bring that part of the Human Rights Code into line with the

interpretation of the charter and, as a result, this bill will do some significant things.

It will, for example, extend pension, survivor and other benefits to the same-sex partners of all private sector employees. It will ensure that same-sex partners get all employment-related benefits, such as bereavement leave, dental and drug plans and the like, that married couples take for granted. It will protect, as I said, people from harassment in the workplace and elsewhere on grounds of sexual orientation and guarantee same sex couples equal treatment with respect to services, facilities, contracts and accommodation in the public and private sectors. It also, for example, would prevent landlords from denying same-sex couples available rental accommodation. It is a significant step forward, but I acknowledge that it's only a start and we have further to go.

The question, then, is: Why not more at this point in time? I see in the gallery some representatives of the organization the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, and I'd like to acknowledge their presence, and I'd like to acknowledge their hard work in moving forward on this issue and forcing the political institutions to advance.

But in the course of trying to achieve some forward movement on this issue, it became clear that this is a bill that could pass this Legislature. I had to make a decision between moving forward with a bill that could pass and moving forward with a bill that I didn't think could pass and made the decision, rightly or wrongly, to proceed with a bill that I thought could make some real achievements in this House, could move forward on the issue of gay and lesbian rights rather than achieve just a pyrrhic victory with a bill that would be defeated and that progress would not be made.

I think back to the by-election, where this issue was a central issue in that campaign, and I talked—as did, to be fair, the candidates of all the three parties—about the issue of advancing gay and lesbian rights, about ensuring that the goal is full equality in all ways. That is a goal I continue to believe in, I will continue to fight for: that we need, as a society, to eliminate discrimination in all its forms. This is one of the most insidious forms, it seems to me, of that discrimination, because, despite the fact that we have amended the Human Rights Code to provide protection, it is still seen in society, I think, as unacceptable. People often find themselves making arguments to justify a position that is not in favour of full equality, going through intellectual gymnastics that I find sometimes difficult to understand.

That being said, in the by-election my leader, Lyn McLeod, made a commitment to extend benefits to the

private sector and called on the government to proceed with its review of legislation. This bill does exactly that. What I said in the by-election was that as a private member it's rare to be able to get things through the Legislature and that my role would be to introduce something and try to get the government to act, to move on the commitment it has made as part of its policy platform.

I'm pleased to see the Attorney General here, and I acknowledge the cooperation of the Attorney General. However, I think it's no coincidence that a few days after I introduced this bill there was an announcement to support both what I put forward and to do that review of legislation. I wish it had been done earlier, and I frankly wish it had not been an issue in the campaign, because I believe that justice delayed is justice denied and it should have been done earlier.

But that being said, I'm glad it's proceeding, and I hope that the suggestion by the Attorney General to move this into the Ontario Law Reform Commission is not an attempt to delay but an attempt to move ahead, to really look at how this needs to proceed and that something will be brought forward that we can vote on in this Legislature and approve.

Let me say to the Attorney General that my personal commitment is that if things are brought forward that are further than this bill, I personally will support those provisions. Now, we'll have to discuss those as a caucus, but I know what my view is.

I'd like also to acknowledge that there are some aspects that this bill does not cover. I think, for example, of Alison Kemper, who was the director of the Church Street Community Centre in the riding of St George-St David, who I thought frankly made an eloquent plea for the issue of adoption and who says, I think quite rightly, that she is discriminated against because that is not provided. I acknowledge that. This bill, unfortunately, does not cover that.

1010

But progress is sometimes evolutionary, not revolutionary, in this place. I think part of the purpose of moving forward at this point is to begin the process of educating ourselves, society, each of us in this chamber that progress can be made, should be made, and that some of the fear that is raised in response to moving forward on equality will not be justified, that in essence Ontarians are more tolerant than some people are prepared to admit.

I have travelled across this province both as a private individual and to a certain degree as a public official and I find pleasant the degree to which Ontarians can be tolerant when you talk to them and explain the situation. I think there is more tolerance in society than sometimes we acknowledge and I hope that part of what we can do with this bill and, if it passes, the justice committee or any hearings that the law reform commission

does, can be part of the process of education, part of the process of appealing to that sense of fair play that I believe Ontarians have.

Finally, I'd like to also briefly pay tribute to my predecessor in this seat, who did move forward as Attorney General on the motion of the member for Ottawa Centre and provided the first step in the struggle for equality for gays and lesbians: Mr Ian Scott. He was Attorney General at the time and moved forward in the face of some quite vociferous opposition and achieved real progress. We're taking a second step, I hope, today, and I hope that the government will pass this bill, not just in second reading but at third reading, and will build on the strength of the former member of this riding.

I think, to be fair, I should also pay tribute to the former member for St George, a member of the Conservative Party, Susan Fish, who was also a supporter of equality for gays and lesbians. I don't want to make this a partisan issue very much, and I think tribute belongs to everybody, because there have been members as well of the Conservative Party who have been prepared to be progressive and have supported the cause of human rights. I think also of Keith Norton, for example, and Phil Gillies and Larry Grossman, who were prepared to stand up and say, "This is right; we should support it," despite the tide in the other direction of their party.

I believe that when we go out and talk to Ontarians in all three parties we will find that sense of fair play, that sense of justice, and we can convince them to support not only this but once we have this debate and complete that education, we can move forward towards the goal of full equality for gays and lesbians.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I'm speaking on behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus. I'd like to put a few things on the record and to comment on this bill and on aspects that it pertains to.

First of all, I'd like to make very clear to the House and to all people in Ontario that our party strongly opposes discrimination in every way. This is not just a passing coincidence; it's something that is really implicit in what our party is all about. From discussions with our leader, Mr Harris, this week and with members of our caucus I'm authorized to speak on behalf of our party, hopefully in the context of one that says and means very, very genuinely that we are unequivocally opposed to all forms of discrimination to all people. As it comes into the whole question of sexual orientation, all the more must we work together to make sure that every effort is made within our society to eliminate and end discrimination in these forms.

Discrimination is as old as time. It's ugly. It's used by the strong or the weak. It's used as a form of intimidation. It's a prey on the vulnerable. It's one of those things that's just one of the very mean-minded things within society. Though no law will ever eliminate



discrimination, it begins to establish boundaries and guidelines and gives guidance to people to know that if they trespass those lines they are going to be taken to court; they're going to be dealt with.

So in this impossible world, to have perfect rights and freedoms for all people, at least we in Ontario must set an example through the law that we are going to protect the rights of others.

I'm concerned as well with the way in which all laws are interpreted. You can't perfectly fulfil the intent of the law. We are now seeing, certainly with young people in my community—and I hear it often—where there is reverse discrimination. At one time, white people were in the majority. Young whites are alarmed and dismayed at what is happening to them. There has to be balance, there has to be fairness and it has to be reflected in the needs of all people.

I'm particularly pleased that yesterday the member for Willowdale and I brought forward two private members' bills: one amendment, the Human Rights Code Amendment Act, which is my bill, and the other one from Mr Harnick, the Civil Rights Protection Act. In both those cases, we have brought in the sense that discrimination, especially as it has to do with hate literature, written, verbal and symbolic in the form of acts of violence against other people. We want to bring in changes to the Human Rights Code and to the civil code that protect people against any kind of discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, family status or handicap. So our party is on record and very much wants to fight the battle with all others who want to end discrimination.

I am concerned about some of the comments that came out during the election campaign in Mr Murphy's election. I find him more moderate today than during the campaign, but I want to read into the record part of the letter that was written by his leader, Lyn McLeod, on March 24 to Mr Nick Mulé. I have to say that her letter offends me. In fact, I am outraged that the leader of the Liberal Party would make the statement that I am now going to quote into the record. But within the context of the letter, her words are:

"I share your community's anger with...the continued discriminatory position of the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party."

I want to comment on that. Politics certainly can be a dirty and foul game, but it's especially offensive when a false or misleading allegation is made. It's especially offensive when a false or a misleading allegation is made during an election campaign, when there is no time to respond. I repeat, the Ontario PC Party is not discriminatory, and we take strong exception to the leader of the Liberal Party trying to put words in our mouths.

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** Your skin is looking a little thin today.

**Mr Cousens:** Don't start being offensive.

Any statement by any one of us in public life can be taken out of context. I think it's very important for you to see that the position I am trying to enunciate today is, put it in context and don't assume the worst of all politicians and don't necessarily believe the allegations others might make. I just want to make it very clear that our party has no desire to be part of any system that does discriminate. I personally would not want to be a member of that party nor to be associated with a group that perpetrates that kind of ill feeling, ill will to others.

The bill that's been put forward by Mr Murphy today is really in two parts. I would like very much to go on record again in support of the first part of his bill, where he is calling for freedom from harassment in accommodation and in employment. The question you really ask on the basis of this is, should a person with a sexual orientation be discriminated against where they live or where they work? The answer is, absolutely not.

So as to the first two parts of the bill, if we could vote on them separately, which you cannot do in the kind of time frame in which we're acting, I would vote in favour of those parts of the bill. To me, it's progressive and it understands something of the hardship that is going on within our society and can begin to lead to an elimination of that hardship.

However, the other part of the bill deals with the Liberal Party's efforts to redefine "marriage." Marriage is presently reserved for heterosexual unions. Certainly, if you look at the history of language and tradition, there is a significant meaning to this very special institution known as marriage. I'm concerned that the effort being made by Mr Murphy and the Liberal Party today is that they're taking the word "marriage" and twisting it around to give it a new definition. I think it's very serious to put a new meaning to old terms and old institutions and I am concerned, by doctoring it or changing it, about what will happen with it.

**1020**

I look at the definition of "marriage," first of all, as it was defined judicially in *Hyde v Hyde and Woodmansee* in 1866:

"Marriage has been well said to be something more than a contract, either religious or civil...to be an institution.... I conceive that marriage, as understood in Christendom, may for this purpose be defined as the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others."

In *Corbett v Corbett* in 1970, Judge Ormrod stated:

"The fundamental purpose of law is the regulation of the relations between persons, and between persons and the state or community...sex is clearly an essential determinant of the relationship called marriage, because

it is and always has been recognized as the union of man and woman. It is the institution on which the family is built, and in which the capacity for natural heterosexual intercourse is an essential element. It has, of course, many other characteristics, of which companionship and mutual support is an important one, but the characteristics which distinguish it from all other relationships can only be met by two persons of opposite sex."

Further, "marriage" is defined in Webster's Third New International Dictionary, 1961, as: "the state of being united to a person of the opposite sex as husband or wife; the mutual relation of husband and wife; wedlock; the institution whereby men and women are joined in a special kind of social and legal dependence for the purpose of founding and maintaining a family."

You look further at the definition of "marriage," and you begin to understand that different religions, Christian, Islamic, Judaism and others, have a very common understanding of marriage where in western societies and other societies, marriage is a concept confined to heterosexual relationships. Clergy—pastors, rabbis, priests—are licensed by the province to marry, so it has both a legal and a religious implication, unless of course it is a civil ceremony. By changing the definition of "marriage," it will certainly affect the way in which the Marriage Act is understood and the actions that are being taken by clergy in response to that responsibility.

I'd also like to refer to the judgement by the Ontario Court of Justice (General Division) on Layland and Beaulne, March 17, 1993, when Justice James Southey said:

"One of the principal purposes of the institution of marriage is the founding and maintaining of families in which children will be produced and cared for, a procedure which is necessary for the continuance of the species.

"That principal purpose of marriage cannot, as a general rule, be achieved in a homosexual union because of the biological limitations of such a union. It is this reality that is recognized in the limitation of marriage to persons of the opposite sex.

"It is true that some married couples are unable or unwilling to have children, and that the incapacity or willingness to procreate is not a bar to marriage or a ground for divorce. Despite these circumstances in which a marriage will be childless, the institution of marriage is intended by the state, by religions and by society to encourage the procreation of children."

There are a number of questions that are raised by virtue of this bill before the House. It has to do with marriage, the whole family context and the long-term implications.

What is the effect on children in a gay and lesbian home? I don't know. Does society really have the

answer to that?

What is the impact on society over the long term as we start redefining fundamental institutions and parts of what our system is all about? What is the long-term implication for society with the follow-through on this bill as marriage is redefined?

And a whole other subject comes into this. What can we do to fight the spread of AIDS? It's now the number one killer in so many cities in the United States. What can we do to fight that? Is there something we can build into certain acts? Are we educating society without incorporating a bias and prejudice?

My concern is that there are many issues around the gay and lesbian community that we have to address. "Marriage" in and of itself is a special word with a specific meaning, and in itself I don't think can be redefined. On the one side, though, the gay and lesbian community wants to see an understanding for the very special relationship that people of the same sex can have. In talking with them and knowing something of their caring for one another, the long-term commitment, the depth of the relationship, the commitment that they have, it is not for us to set that aside as being anything other than a very significant relationship which should be, in some way, defined and understood by the law.

What does the gay and lesbian community want? They want recognition for that kind of relationship, but they also want to have something of the economic benefits of a family or of a spousal relationship. It has a large economic impact which has to do with pension plans, social benefits, the Ontario Guaranteed Annual Income Act, OHIP, social assistance, and it will affect a whole range of laws that make up what Ontario is all about. These are not just small costs, they're hard costs, but I'm saying they should be assessed and appraised.

As the Legislature looks at the whole new issue that has been raised by Mr Murphy in this bill, what we really need to do as a society, when many of these programs are now in question, as they are today, we've got to appreciate the total implications of what this bill means.

I want to raise two points:

Can we not look at having new terminology to describe the very special relationship and liaison that gays and lesbians have, without taking away or changing or redefining the meaning of "marriage" as we've known it? I challenge Mr Murphy, as a lawyer, to look at that as a very meaningful point. I say you are changing something that society has appreciated and understood in one way. To redefine it, as you are through this bill, is taking a step that I find unacceptable.

The second matter that falls into this is, if your bill is really trying to provide special benefits and support for gay and lesbian couples, then let that be a separate issue in which we can look at all the implications, all



the costs and all the things that are going to be involved with that. Let's deal with that, and if society has a responsibility in that area, let us sit down and talk about it. Don't try to bring in all the benefits of married couples through the back door. Don't try to develop a policy that has long-term implications to all other parts of the province.

Let's put all the facts on the table as they pertain to this issue. Let's count the cost and let's at the same time try to find a way of building bridges between all of society. Let's take down as many walls as are being put up by human beings and find ways of making sure that we understand each other, that we build bridges of friendship, we build bridges of understanding, we end discrimination and we find a way in which society can work in harmony.

**Mr Winninger:** I'd certainly like to commend the member for St George-St David for bringing forward Bill 45 today. I also appreciate his expression of his own articles of good faith in supporting this government when it does bring forward its own legislation this fall, which will at a very minimum incorporate the proposals under Bill 45.

I would also support Bill 45 going to a standing committee of this government, because I feel we need to hear from the public of Ontario so that we know whether Bill 45 goes far enough. Some of us think it doesn't go far enough.

Quite frankly, I was surprised that a Liberal member was re-elected in St George-St David. For many years under a Liberal government, there was, as the member has indicated, much talk about taking a positive, forceful thrust in this direction, but the thrust never really materialized.

I recognize that the former Attorney General, Ian Scott, is a man of prodigious intellect and probably one of the finest legal minds in the country—certainly the case law is replete with reports of his celebrated cases—yet despite five years in office, no meaningful initiative was taken in this respect. Mr Scott has told people he's the finest Attorney General Ontario ever had. In my respectful submission, the jury may still be out on this point, because certainly Mr Scott never had an NDP Attorney General to compare himself to today.

1030

I would also suggest that I'm perhaps a little disappointed that the bill didn't go further, particularly in light of the letter of Mr Murphy's leader, Lyn McLeod, sent out on March 9, 1993, during the by-election in St George-St David, which certainly suggested to me that there would be a more positive direction coming from this government.

In any event, it was in 1986 that sexual orientation became a prohibited ground of discrimination under the Ontario Human Rights Code with regard to certain

services, accommodation and employment, thanks to Bill 7 of my colleague the Honourable Evelyn Gigantes, and it was in 1990 that my colleague Frances Lankin, the then Chair of the Management Board, announced in this Legislature that all employee benefits except survivor pension benefits would be available to same-sex partners of public service employees. Since then, our government has made efforts to obtain the consent of the federal government to amend the Pension Act to permit pension rights for same-sex partners.

In any event, the Leshner decision back in September 1992 ordered this government, under the Human Rights Code, to extend survivor pension benefits to same-sex couples. In fact, the government was ordered to rewrite the definition of "marital status" to include same-sex couples. As you know, this government chose not to appeal that decision.

Clearly, when Ontario statutes provide particular treatment or benefits to common-law, opposite-sex couples, denial of equal treatment or benefits to same-sex couples is, *prima facie*, discriminatory unless it can be saved under section 1 of the charter, which, as you know, states that justification must be clear and demonstrable in a free and democratic society.

Despite amendments to the code, same-sex couples face many statutory barriers to equality. They are denied rights available to opposite-sex couples. For example, it's difficult for same-sex couples to share responsibility for partners' children. It's difficult to claim compensation or benefits for partners killed or injured in the workplace or as a result of a criminal act. It prohibits certain decisions with regard to medical treatment and funeral arrangements.

There are many existing challenges in the courts and boards and tribunals challenging provincial and federal legislation, including the right to employment benefits, marriage, birth registration, old-age security, survivor pensions, bereavement leave and the right of a same-sex spouse to claim support under the Family Law Act. While court decisions may set a broad direction for reform, they can't substitute for legislative change in such a complex area. Furthermore, resolution on a case-by-case basis may lead to conflicting results, it may involve significant delay and cost, and—

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** How much?

**Mr Winninger:** My friend from Scarborough asks how much. Well, substantial dollars, which are scarce in today's time of recession.

At the same time, some would like to ensure that, where rights are meted out in the courts, corresponding corollary obligations are also enforced.

So the law must evolve, I feel, to reflect changing concepts of marriage and the family in contemporary society. We must deal with discrimination both in terms

of lack of tolerance or acceptance by individuals and organizations. We must change our legal structures accordingly, and institutions of society and government.

For these reasons, I would support Mr Murphy's bill as a first step, because it certainly deals with harassment due to sexual orientation in accommodation and employment, and redefines, moreover, the definition of "spouse" as it is applicable to statutes governed by the Human Rights Code.

There are, as you may know, several other statutes that are not covered under the ambit of the act, and we must look at these as well. We need to move forward by sending this bill to committee, but at the same time we must look at some of the issues that this bill does not address.

I'm pleased that our government is committed to introducing, this fall, progressive legislation that moves forward in a very significant direction that I hope will meet the needs and aspirations of the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario.

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I'm pleased to stand in my place today to support this piece of legislation and to congratulate my colleague the member for St George-St David for bringing this forward.

I'd like to say that I'm a little sorry to see the level of the debate on such an important issue, an issue of fairness and equity, deteriorate to such a partisan level. I think this is the type of issue where we should rise above our partisan considerations and not start to criticize other colleagues or other parties for stands they have taken or have not taken.

I feel that we are elected by our constituents to stand in our place and to try to move the benchmarks of society a little further forward so that we can provide a home for all our citizens and to reach out into the community. I know this is very tough stuff, and maybe why we get into that sort of rhetoric is that it is tough stuff to talk about for many of us.

Mr Speaker, just to say to you, I was at a diplomatic dinner the other day. We were talking about tough issues. It's interesting that in the diplomatic community they have another kind of language than other occupations in politics. We have our language and diplomacy; they have their language. In the common vernacular, when we do something that's maybe a little gutsy, diplomats would call that being brave. If you're doing something that's sort of totally foolish, which some people in our business believe in supporting this bill is, they say that's bold, that's a bold move, and they kind of tone these things down.

This is neither really a brave nor a bold thing to do; it's just the right thing to do, as Ed Brimley would say on those cereal commercials. It is the right thing to do and I'm glad to stand in my place and to say that. I'd like to mention why, because in this debate we've had

many members start, and I'm sure there are going to be more, getting into all sorts of definitions of what the family is and what a couple is and what a marriage is. For me those sort of comments aren't really what's really important about this.

To me, it's just a matter of equity. It's treating all our citizens fairly in society. I think that many of our problems today in society are such that we're out there and being so cognizant of all our differences and pointing out our differences to each other we're dividing ourselves. What we really need to be starting to do is starting to work towards finding more of those things that we find we have in common if we're really to build a society out there.

We are in a democracy, and democracies are not really about forging laws that just accommodate the majority. In a democracy what we want to do is to make sure that we include everyone who is in our society. We have to make sure that everyone in society feels a part of the whole, and some of us in various regards are different from one another. But we must be able to work towards finding a place for everyone in our society. That means we need to look through our laws and make sure that we expunge those laws and regulations that exclude people from, I guess, just in this case, benefits that most of us take for granted.

What we're really talking about is personal relationships. I think we would all, in our very quiet moments, really accept that the world is quite a lonely place. Because of that, we all seek out companionship and love in this world, and many of us are lucky to have found a partner. My wife, Kathy, and I are lucky to have found ourselves. My wife, Kathy, happens to be of the opposite sex, but for some people, when they find that companion, that person they love, they find that person is not of the opposite sex but of the same sex.

Why is it for me in my right, then, to say to those people who happen to have found somebody they love of the same sex that somehow that's not right and that they should be denied all those regular benefits that I accept from my job here and that my wife shares with me. I don't think we should be excluding those rights and privileges, those benefits that people have bargained for in collective bargaining or derived from their work. I think that's important.

1040

What do we do about this? Do we just say to these folks, "I'm sorry, you don't have rights, you don't have privileges, you don't have access to these benefits"? I don't think so. I think we have to start to move on now and not be judgemental as to whether these types of relationships are right or wrong or normal or parallel our concepts of what family are and what relationships are, but to accept that that is the situation and that these people should not be denied any rights.

In closing, I would just like to say that in many of



these issues we kind of forget who we all are, and all of us in society are all from us and our families, and the people that we're talking about today are basically our brothers and our sisters and they're our sons and our daughters. They are us, they are part of our community, and I feel this is important to bring this forward because we need to start to knit society together. We need to include everybody together. We need to include our brothers and sisters and our sons and our daughters.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York):** I want to very quickly thank the member for St George-St David for his motion. I wanted to comment as well on the comments that David Ramsay from Timiskaming has made. I agree with much of what he has said, and I think he needs to be taken in that spirit, because otherwise we will have problems in this House and in the larger society.

I want to say that gay and lesbian people today clearly face discrimination, today and in the past, and I suspect it will continue, both in terms of lack of tolerance, respect or acceptance by other individuals and organizations in society and in the legal structures and institutions of our society and in government. This discrimination has a long history, and it's likely to continue to have a long history unless we, as a government, begin to set the example of how we can deal with this discrimination.

Just this morning, I heard on the news that Athena Cards at Eaton Centre was ordered by the mall management to take down a Lesbian and Gay Pride Day poster because of complaints and concerns about a negative image. That's what I'm talking about. Discrimination is deeply embedded in our society and in the minds of individuals and in our institutions, and unless we show leadership in changing that, it will continue.

I want to acknowledge the motion by the member for St George-St David, because it begins to address the issues of discrimination against gays and lesbians and it will extend the protection from harassment in employment and accommodation to sexual orientation. That's important. Any number of people have talked about that and talked about how we need to continue to look at other laws that discriminate against other individuals.

While on the one hand I want to praise this motion that's before us, I want to urge members to look at what more needs to be done to deal with these issues. What we can't do is to let the courts define social policy in this area. The courts are moving faster than we are as legislators to deal with issues of inequality and to deal with issues of discrimination. We should not allow them to set policy on this matter. We in this Legislature should move faster than they to set policy, and set policy in a way that accommodates all of the issues that need to be dealt with in a way that judges cannot do. Let's not wait for them to change the laws; let us do that in advance of that.

Relationships between gays and lesbians should not be seen as a detriment, should not be seen as something that isn't normal; it should be seen as a part of who we are as human beings, and that I'm no better than they or they better than me. But we need to accept the fact that gays and lesbians exist in society and that is their sexual orientation, and I can't change that nor do I want to change that. Relationships of gays and lesbians and their rights cannot wait. It cannot wait, it affects their lives. So some of us say, "Let's look at it and let's study it." I say, "We can't wait, and let's study it."

I'm waiting very, very anxiously for the bill that will be coming forth from the Attorney General, Marion Boyd from London Centre, because I know it will go farther than what we have here today in terms of protecting rights for gays and lesbians. I say the test for non-discrimination is how far we as legislators can go to change the laws that discriminate against gays and lesbians. When people talk about discrimination, it isn't enough to simply say that the test is, will they support the laws that change discriminatory practices? I'm proud to support this and proud in the future to support laws that will be coming forth from Marion Boyd.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** As the critic for human rights, I'm very proud to stand in my place and to commend my colleague from St George-St David for bringing forth private member's Bill 45.

I will take up from my colleague from the government side who just said, "We can't wait."

I remember in 1986 when Bill 7 was brought forward to the House—I was then the Minister of Housing—and discriminating people, about access, because of their sexual orientation was being debated. It wasn't enough, but we couldn't wait. We went forward and we made that law.

I would say to the members too that of course Bill 45, the private member's bill, may not be enough, but we can't wait. I would urge members to support it right through and make sure it becomes law, so of course when the Attorney General introduces her bill we will also advance it more. We just can't wait.

What is this bill asking? It is asking here that the legislation conform with the Charter of Rights. It's asking also, as it said in 1992, in August of last year, that the Ontario Court of Appeal ruled that the Canadian Human Rights Code violates the Charter of Rights, it says they should adhere to that. It's also asking that in September 1992 the human rights tribunal ordered the provincial government to extend the survivors' pension benefits to the same-sex partners of its employees.

But basically, the bill itself asks for maybe a couple of amendments, and the amendments are pretty simple, for sexual orientation. I urge that they protect and advance this bill to make the protection of those people who are being discriminated in that respect.

I'm tempted somehow to get into a longer debate, but my colleague wants to speak too and I want to leave some time for her. I would like to just appeal to all members, all legislators here, not to blame society's ills, society's diseases, whatever is causing that in society, because of gays and lesbians. I was really appalled to know that AIDS is being blamed on the gays and lesbians, as is said by my colleague the Conservative from Markham. I presume we can also say heart disease and asthma is all caused by certain people who are sexually orientated differently.

We are intelligent people. We are here to protect people. This is a human rights issue, and please, let's not be distracted about this, and not blame people for all this. If we do that, what happens? The chicken does come home to roost eventually.

The fact is that disease has no discrimination. It affects all of us. I was very appalled to know that is the approach the member takes.

Human rights is a very important issue today, especially in Canada, especially in a society that is so diverse. People are discriminated for all different reasons, and I ask the members here in the Legislature to look at this. Sure it's not enough, sure it's only the introduction of this bill and the second reading will go, and I ask you all to support it right through to make it law so that when the Attorney General brings forth her legislation, we will look at it in that very intelligent way too to make sure that people are not discriminated in any way possible, because that's what we are here for.

As my colleague from Timiskaming has said, we just cannot in any way feel that we must do the popular thing, but we should do the right thing.

1050

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I rise to support the bill put forward by the member for St George-St David. He is to be congratulated. Same-sex spouses ought to have the same rights and obligations as common-law spouses of the opposite sex. Homosexuals must be free from harassment.

We had an incident in my riding of Peterborough a couple of weeks ago at a dance. Several women were assaulted simply because they were gay. The police had to be called in. Yet the incident would not have become known to the general public as a case of gay-bashing if concerned witnesses had not organized a demonstration and made sure that we were all made aware.

Last Sunday, I attended an anti-hate rally in Peterborough. The good attendance was probably partly due to the incident I have described and partly due to the kind of news that we're getting from Germany, Yugoslavia and other places that shows what hate and discrimination do to a society.

Many different groups were represented at this rally, including visible minorities and psychiatric survivors.

These groups have one thing in common: Because a label can be attached to them which may have little to do with who they really are as human beings, they can be scapegoated. When life doesn't go well for those who see themselves as regular members of society, they take out their frustration on members of labelled groups.

Our society needs to use the tools available to it to normalize the situation of labelled groups. Fortunately, perceptions have been changing and we have made progress already on many fronts. We are, in many ways, a progressive society but we still have not incorporated in our legislation the realization that homosexual people frequently have lasting spousal relationships.

I disagree with the member for Markham. Such relationships are as meaningful to those as they are to those involved in a regular marriage. They are a stabilizing element in our society and provide mutual support for those involved. They should not be relegated to the fringes of society. They should not have to hide or be ashamed.

The effect of recognizing spousal relationships will allow the strengthening of family links which might otherwise have gone unacknowledged. Let's preserve the family by admitting that families come in many forms. To me, the real tragedy is promiscuity and not sexual orientation.

Someone I knew died recently. He had a long-standing same-sex partner, but this was not indicated in the death notice in the local newspaper. There was no name given of a person to whom condolences could be sent. Exclusion of this kind can only increase suffering. There is no benefit.

I recently read a wonderful book, the *Headhunter* by Timothy Findley. It is a book about Toronto and the people who live here, about madness, sanity and good and evil, and the labels don't tell us who the good people are. Mr Findley is a great and well-loved Ontarian, and his same-sex relationship with Bill Whitehead is a major part of who he is. Why should we withhold basic rights from people like this?

I support this legislation and the opportunity it presents for public discussion of this issue. I look forward to more comprehensive legislation from the government on this issue in the fall.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orile):** I too would like to participate in the debate by beginning with a compliment for my colleague the member for St George-St David, who has presented to this Legislature a bill which is all about ending discrimination and encouraging the NDP government to do what it said it would do and to keep its promise, because there are many in the gay and lesbian community of Ontario who are very disappointed that we haven't seen action from the government on a very clear commitment that it made.

The point I want to make as I say that, and I've been



listening very carefully to the debate in the House, is that this really is not a partisan issue. There have been advocates and proponents of ending of discrimination and we've had a long record and history in that tradition from all three parties in this Legislature, and in fact in this country.

If you go back to 1940, actually 1944, it was Conservative Premier George Drew who stood in this very Legislature and said these words, and I quote: "We have a very simple choice to make. When we say that Canada is a land of freedom and equality, we either mean what we say or we do not." That was Conservative Premier George Drew in 1944, and the history of Ontario's leadership in ending discrimination has been an agonizing one, a slow one. I'm sad to say that as we stand here in 1993, almost 50 years since George Drew stood in this place, we have not made the progress to achieve equality that I think he perhaps had envisioned even in those days. So we have this debate in this Legislature once again.

What has happened since 1944 to today and why are we having this debate again? As I said, it troubles me that people try to paint this as a partisan issue. I want to take issue with my colleague from Markham, because I believe that he is misguided in his view and I don't believe he is speaking on behalf of the Conservative caucus. He may be presenting an individual view, I hope that is the case, because in a recent election campaign the leader of the Conservative caucus was very clear in his support of the extension of same-sex benefits to common-law spouses and to same-sex spouses.

In fact, I have a copy of campaign literature that went out under the name of the candidate Nancy Jackman. The quote from Mike Harris, Ontario PC leader, on her brochure said:

"Nancy Jackman has done more to support policy measures concerning AIDS, same-sex spousal benefits and equity issues than any member of the Liberal-NDP governments of the past eight years." Doesn't that sound like Mike Harris? "I look forward to her continued and direct involvement on these issues as the next MPP for St George-St David." He said that very recently. I know he's disappointed that she's not here.

What's interesting about that campaign is that all three candidates in that by-election had the same support for extension of same-sex spousal benefits as was stated in Ms Jackman's brochure. What we have today is the present member for St George-St David putting that forward in a bill in this House and we have an opportunity in a non-partisan way to see that move forward and become reality in Ontario.

Further in the brochure, I just want to point out, Ms Jackman went on to very clearly say where the Conservative leader came from on this issue. She said:

"My leader, Mike Harris, is encouraging me to work to redefine the term 'spouse' in all legislation. It must include a wider range of individuals in committed, supportive relationships, including same-sex couples. Too many of our families have suffered because governments have not acted to recognize our relationships." She goes on to say in her literature, "I would also press the NDP...." She makes this a non-partisan clarion call in her literature and is very clear about where the Conservative leader stands on this issue.

I believe we cannot allow the courts to set law and policy. That is the role of the Legislature. We have a ruling from the Ontario human rights tribunal ordering the provincial government to make changes in its laws to end discrimination. I call on all members of this House today, by support of this resolution and support of the new member for St George-St David, to take yet one more small step down the road of achieving equality for all, ending an additional example of discrimination in this province.

I say to you, Mr Speaker, I will be supporting this resolution and this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for St George-St David has two minutes in summation.

**Mr Murphy:** I appreciate the interventions and comments from the members for all parties. I think of the member for Markham, a member of the Progressive Conservative caucus, and I'm not sure whether I heard him correctly. If I hear what he's saying, that they're prepared to support the extension of benefits, the extension of rights, the provision of obligations equivalent to marriage, equivalent to common law, provided it's called something else, I don't understand the position, but if that's what they're saying, I'd like to see them introduce a bill to do that. I, of course, would support it absolutely. Maybe that's not what he's saying.

As to the member for Fort York and the member for London South, I'll deal with the member for Fort York first, who says we can't wait. I agree we can't wait. I think it's interesting that the government didn't act until it was told to by the tribunal. If they're prepared to say now that they can't wait, let's go straight to third reading. We don't need to go to committee. Let's go straight to third reading, pass it and make it law now. I'm prepared to do that.

As to the member for London South, to say that no meaningful steps were taken by the Liberal government, that's entirely not the case. It was the Liberal government that passed the amendment to Bill 7, that moved forward with that bill to make progress on this issue. It was the Liberal government, the predecessor member in this very seat, the Honourable Ian Scott, who brought that forward, argued for it and made it happen, and that was a first step and an important step.

This is a second and an important step, and I hope

it's not just a commitment to pass it at second reading; let's go straight to third reading. There is a precedent for that happening in this House. My colleague from Mississauga West introduced a private member's bill that went right through to third reading. We could have the obligation to provide those benefits in the private sector tomorrow if this government were prepared to do it. I ask them to do it, and I'd be glad to support it if they did.

**The Acting Speaker:** I wish to thank the honourable member. This completes the time allotted to ballot item number 17, or the second reading of Bill 45, and we will further deal with this bill at 12 o'clock.

1100

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT  
(TAX EXEMPTIONS), 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LES MUNICIPALITÉS  
(EXONÉRATION D'IMPÔTS)

Mr Jordan moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 46, An Act to amend the Municipal Act to provide for Tax Exemptions / Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités pour prévoir des exonérations d'impôts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** The honourable member for Lanark-Renfrew will have 10 minutes to open up debate, at which point all recognized parties in the Legislature will then have a total of 15 minutes to participate in the debate, then the honourable member from Lanark-Renfrew will have two minutes to sum up.

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** I first of all would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that this Bill 46 is not legislation independent by itself. I can best refer to it as enabling legislation.

I have sat on the committee for private bills and regulations now for over two years, and a number of municipalities have come forward with their lawyers and their chief executive officers, along with their member, to present a private bill to exempt a certain museum from property tax. Why we look at the museums is that we look at them as being an educational facility. I think the municipalities that have come forward individually see them also as educational facilities, and to be taking money from them and applying it to taxation and then trying to raise more money in the community to keep the museum going is a completely inefficient way of managing such an important function in the community as the museum.

Bill 46 will grant the choice to the municipality. The committee on regulations and private bills has been dealing, as I say, with individual municipalities. This enabling legislation will take away that need, relative to museums only. It does not give any blanket authority

generally to non-profit organizations within the community. This legislation relates to museums, and museums only, and the Lieutenant Governor has the right to designate the requirements of the museum under section 9:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the requirements that museums shall meet for the purposes of this section."

Some of my communities are saying, "We at the present time do not feel that we want the museum exempt from municipal and educational tax." That's very good and fine, because they don't have to pass the bylaw under this legislation that would be required to exempt these museums.

In the riding of Lanark-Renfrew, there are 15 museums vital for rural culture and heritage.

To take one, the Victoria School Museum in Carleton Place has educational services including an outreach program called Museum in a Trunk. The people there since 1986 have visited upwards of 10,000 people with Museum in a Trunk to make sure that the educational aspect of that museum is taken to places other than the site at the Victoria School in Carleton Place. The Victoria School itself perhaps would not be there today had not a group of volunteers interested in the heritage of the building and a place for the museum articles and history of Carleton Place and area—it was their coming together that actually saved the building and brought the museum to one place in Carleton Place.

In the riding of Lanark-Renfrew, going across the towns, the Perth Museum, a nationally designated museum, has four Victorian period rooms and an enclosed garden, and gives an intimate glimpse of the lifestyle of the family in those ages.

Again, I want to point out that this legislation does not stand alone. This is only enabling legislation to enable a municipality to exempt a museum for tax purposes, should that municipality see that it is of benefit to that community and to the people as a whole. This legislation in no way forces the municipality to act, but it does give it the right and it does save it, should it want to act, from coming here to Toronto to present a private bill for exemption of a specific museum.

In the current environment of excessive taxation, it is becoming difficult for the museums to fund their operations, because at present, a good number of the visitors to the museums are families and children from the different schools, starting with grade 1, right through to the grade 13 level. I consulted taxpayers, municipal officials and museum personnel, and there was a very strong consensus that this bill would be an effective means by which communities could choose to enhance local heritage. There was also a consensus that Bill 46 provided a fair approach because decisions would be made locally and would be democratically accountable.



The people in my communities where these 15 museums are have much freer access to the mayor and council than they do to a standing committee here in the Legislature, to have to go to the expense of travelling to Toronto, perhaps bringing their lawyer and a representative of the community to come before the committee to get exemption for a museum.

Bill 46 places the decision-making power in the hands of the people affected by the decision. Instead of shifting another burden upon municipalities, as has been done all too often in recent times, we are this time going to empower local governments. That's the crux of the whole amendment to the act: to empower the local government to exempt museums if that community, the mayor and council, after a presentation from the museum board, sees it as the right thing to do.

1110

I could mention the museum in the town of Smiths Falls, the Rideau Canal Museum. I just spoke with the Premier the other day regarding that museum, which he personally opened a year or so ago and made a considerable contribution, through this government, to that museum. At that time, I believe the Premier gave \$250,000 to the Rideau Canal Museum to make sure it was going to be completed properly and be a real landmark in eastern Ontario.

I can say to you today, it is a real landmark in eastern Ontario. It gives the whole history of eastern Ontario in the most modern way. I would certainly invite anyone from this Legislature, if you have the opportunity and you're in the area. I think it's one of the most modern museums and most educational that I have in my riding.

As the Premier pointed out, it's very difficult to have museums self-sustaining financially. It's very few museums that are not of excellent educational value, and they do supplement the schools in the area, and not only the schools in the area, but children come in by bus from good miles away. During the summer, it's a great place for families on vacation to come and give their children a chance to understand the different historic events of eastern Ontario.

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** The member for Lanark-Renfrew and I have the privilege of sitting on the same committee, the standing committee on regulations and private bills. As he has so ably pointed out, that committee in fact receives these particular requests from municipalities and other charitable organizations throughout the province on quite a regular basis; in fact, most of the time, I would say probably 90% to 95% of the time, where those organizations meet a set of criteria, they are approved for those exemptions.

So I think it really recognizes the contribution of that particular institution in the case the member has brought forward, museums in our communities, that they be recognized not only for their cultural contribution but

the fact that in all likelihood it's public money moving from the municipality to the organization to pay those property taxes, and then it just basically goes back to the municipality. In my other life, I would have said "Peter paying Paul," but you know, that's the way it goes. We try to be a little more formal here.

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** Betty paying Judy.

**Ms Haeck:** Oh, okay. Thanks, Gord.

Anyway, the reality is that those are basically the same moneys flowing back and forth, and personally, I really see that the exemption has some value. I know there are some other views out there. Definitely the Fair Tax Commission has some views. Their view is that the municipality should grant the organization in question an ample amount of money to cover the liability of a property tax and therefore offset this liability.

Again, my view is that it's the same money flowing back and forth, so I think we could deal with this kind of issue in the way the member suggests, and if the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, possibly, and some of the other ministries that have some responsibility for these organizations got together and developed a policy that was consistent. That's one of the cruxes in all of this. Any tax policy has to be seen to be fair and consistently applied across the province. This is something that has to be discussed. The criteria and the framework in which all of this is working has to be hammered out, and everyone who is involved truly has to understand what the obligations are.

I am aware, and I think the member is as well, that definitely within those ministries there has been some discussion from our own committee work in the standing committee on regulations and private bills. There regularly is the admonition from the committee members, and as Chair I don't get involved in those discussions, but I'm interested in their comments, that the ministries should be developing that policy. I have to say to my colleagues on all sides of the House that I heartily concur with their comments. But I think for the public at large, those folks who may be viewing this morning's proceedings and those who are in the galleries, I did at least want to let them know what the criteria are that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has set forward by which we consider these organizations. So let me just read these five points.

First of all, as the member for Lanark-Renfrew has pointed out, the museum in question should own and occupy the property. They should be a registered charity under the Income Tax Act of Canada. The exemption applies to property taxes and not to other charges such as local improvement charges. The consent of the upper tier—and let's explain that; I come from the area of the province called the Niagara Peninsula and it has a regional municipal government, so that's the upper

tier—and the school board is to be obtained. The exemption is to be granted through a municipal bylaw. That, in fact, really and truly means that the municipality has to be on side with this and also come to us as a committee indicating that they are in favour. So I think any organization that goes through this process—and for some organizations that have come before our committee it has taken at least two years to fulfil all of the obligations, get all of the approvals. It's time-consuming. There is really and truly an accountability framework.

I believe the member has brought forward an important point in our local municipalities and I will be supporting his bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** Mr Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to rise and speak in favour of this bill, because I very much favour it. I have a very strong belief that we should recognize the municipal governments in this province, being operated by locally elected councils, and give them the authority to make local decisions locally. I'm very pleased to know that the previous Liberal government did in fact have a bill along these lines which was considerably broader, but recognizing the right and indeed the responsibility of locally elected councils to determine local matters. It would include such things as the matter of the exemption for museums. The member for Lanark-Renfrew, in introducing the bill, made several good points about museums and how tremendously educational they are. That is certainly very true. Having taken the opportunity whenever I'm visiting other parts of the province to go through museums, I am astounded at what is there and indeed I'm always learning something new. Of course, at my age that's not unusual because I haven't seen everything.

The tourism aspect is so important these days. Many municipalities are concentrating on that and museums certainly attract tourists in very great numbers. I would also stress the importance and probably the greatest advantage of having museums, and indeed we should have more, because they save invaluable, irreplaceable artifacts. As you know, many families have collected and saved artifacts through the generations of their families, both while in this country and from other countries that they've emigrated from. It's awfully important to save those things because many things can be thrown out inadvertently or indeed in order to get rid of them. The museum collectors, curators, know what should be saved and what is used now that will some day become an important artifact. So I think it's very important.

1120

He also mentioned the problem of getting before the regulations and private bills committee. I don't think that's as much of a problem, in my view, but the

problem is that an applicant isn't assured of getting approval.

Indeed, yesterday we saw an applicant come forward for an exemption, the humane society of a municipality that operates a haven for stray and lost animals on behalf of the municipality, which met all five criteria to be approved, and lo and behold, what do you suppose happened? The committee refused the application. The government members refused because the representative of the Solicitor General said, "Oh, we want to deal with the whole picture, the whole framework of that." They wouldn't say when they were going to, who's going to do it and whether or not we'd have any input. But that is the case, and it was the greatest disappointment. So I have no faith in that process. It's seriously shaken at this time.

Coming back to exemption for museums, I think it's necessary. In my own county we have had a recent endowment of a very large collection, the Harrison M. Scheak collection, which must be housed, and if this bill is passed it will give the municipality the opportunity to obtain accommodation for this important collection. Maybe it will be leased accommodation. I don't know how it'll be arranged, but it's the important factor now, and it's a very important collection, antiquities of great value, will bring tourists, will be educational, and I support it completely.

In concluding, I'm very much in favour of this bill and I do thank the member for Lanark-Renfrew for bringing it forward at that time, in view of the fact that the bill of the previous government did not see conclusion to be approved.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I'm sure that if you were not sitting in the chair today you'd probably like to stand in your own place and support another colleague from eastern Ontario. I know that in your own area of Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry and East Grenville there are a number of museums there as well, and we all know that, particularly in the rural communities, these small museums—I think of the Osgoode historical museum in the township of Osgoode—are run by volunteers for the most part, there's a tremendous amount of effort put into it by the community and quite frankly it's very, very difficult for them to make ends meet.

Museums are not visited by huge numbers of people. They have certain people in your community who are interested in that aspect, but over a period of time they serve a tremendous, tremendous resource for the community which perhaps would be forgotten in the long run. Schools take their children to these particular institutions across eastern Ontario and spend half a day or a day at these places and the young children pick up a lot of what happened, not historically in terms of the big picture but in their own local area.



Throughout eastern Ontario, for instance, we have a tremendous number of families who have been there for over 200 years, came across the St Lawrence as United Empire Loyalists, and those names have continued on generation after generation. It's of a great deal of historical importance to the people of eastern Ontario that those ties remain and the knowledge about those ties remains.

I myself am a descendent of a United Empire Loyalist who came across the St Lawrence River from around Albany, New York, in and around about 1780, and throughout eastern Ontario there are people who are associated with my forefathers' names. I'm very much interested that this heritage be protected and that somebody keep track of that and that people are willing to give their time and effort. I think of Elizabeth Stewart, of the township of Osgoode, who's given countless efforts, a former schoolteacher who has put a lot of her life after she retired from teaching into this particular institution in the township of Osgoode.

I want, however, to talk a little bit about the regulations committee, which has dealt with this particular kind of item in the past. As you know, I've been here for 16 years and have had the opportunity to visit that committee; I think I've sat on that committee on one or two occasions over the history of my legislative career. But I was always amazed that, whether it was our majority government from 1981 to 1985, a majority government of the Liberals from 1987 to 1990 or, now, the majority government of the New Democratic Party that we are now suffering through—no, I mean that we are now under—the problem is that members of the committee go into this particular committee dealing with private bills. In general, they have not taken a great deal of interest in them because they are not earth-shattering. What happens to a museum down in Timbuc-too may not be of any importance to a member from the centre of Toronto or whatever.

I'm not alleging that members are negligent or uncaring because they don't know about what's happening down in Lanark or the north part of Lanark or wherever it is, but what I'm saying is that in our day-to-day lives, particularly during these periods of times, there's a lot of stuff on our agenda. Whether or not a museum in Perth is given a tax relief is quite frankly not at the top of every legislator's agenda in this place. We as legislators walk into that committee and we immediately look to the officials, the bureaucrats, to tell us what to do, and what happens is that the bureaucrats are, in essence, making a political decision. They are making a decision on behalf of Ontario politicians, but, more particularly local politicians who have, in general, requested this change to the law. They have to come down here to Queen's Park in order to get a change.

I think a very important part, particularly for small municipalities—and I hasten to say to the member

who's brought this particular resolution forward that I would imagine in some of his municipalities he has populations of 300 or 400 people who might have a museum. When they come down to Queen's Park or want to give a tax relief to a particular institution like a museum, it's pretty expensive for a small municipality to come down here, to send its representatives, to hire a lawyer, to have the bill printed. A private bill costs something like \$800, I believe, the printing costs to the Queen's printer. By the time you're all finished and it's all done, a municipality can incur expenses of \$4,000 to \$5,000. For the city of Ottawa, the city of Toronto, the city of Nepean, the large cities, that's really a drop in the bucket. That's not big money for them. The city of Toronto has a budget of \$3.5 billion. To say they're concerned about \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$5,000 is not a lot.

But when you talk about some of the areas that Mr Jordan represents and that I represent and that you represent and that Mr Eddy represents, \$4,000 or \$5,000 is a fair chunk of their budget. It might, in some cases, add up on the mill rate—I don't know how many points, but they might add up to a certain amount.

1130

The other important part of this is that we have just received, yesterday or the day before, a report by the Sewell commission on planning. I find it ironic that we're talking about a little issue like giving tax relief from property tax for the museum. We say, or the government says, "We want to retain control of that decision at the provincial level," yet Mr Sewell's recommendation within his report is that he wants to devolve all the planning authority on the municipality.

On the one hand we have a decision like deciding, with a little museum, sitting out in the country usually, in many cases an old converted schoolhouse or whatever, "You have to come down to Queen's Park." The provincial government, the provincial bureaucrats, have to occupy their time. I didn't even talk about the cost of the bureaucrats involved in this kind of decision. "You have to come all the way down to Toronto." We make a decision like that, but what we're going to do is we're going to give local municipalities the right to make all of the planning decisions in the future. To me, there's a tremendous dichotomy in these two kinds of examples of giving autonomy or power to the municipality to make decisions.

If in fact this government follows the Sewell commission and says local municipalities shall have the right to make all planning decisions, of course in accordance with government guidelines, falling in line with county or regional plans and township plans and zoning bylaws etc, but giving what I consider probably the most powerful tool as to the cost of what's going to happen in the future to down at the local level, I find it almost amusing that on the other hand, the province still has to maintain power over what I call tiddly-wink kinds of

decisions like deciding whether a museum should be exempt from property tax or shouldn't be exempt from property tax.

I think the other part that we are learning in terms of the evolution of government is that people out there in the community now are saying to us, "We want decisions that can get down as close to the people who are affected as possible." I think that whether it's the NDP government, or a Conservative or a Liberal government, or whoever carries on over the next five or ten years, you will see, I believe, as you read about the evolution of government in the United States and as you read about the evolution of government in Canada, provincial governments, state governments, federal governments, all governments, will try to devolve down to a local level as many of the decision-making powers as possible.

In some of the readings that I have undertaken over the past in terms of reforming government, of reshaping government, of reinventing government, they're even suggesting that some of this decision power go even lower than the municipal level, that it go into the communities, that it be given out to even a lower level of government than local municipalities.

I don't believe this is a huge leap. I think what this government should do is pass this bill. They should take it into committee and they should say, "We not only want to deal with museums, but we want to maybe deal with a few other things as well." Set out in it what criteria are necessary for a municipality to pass this kind of forgiveness of property tax, and say to the municipality—balance the law by amendment to Bill 46 to respect the school board, to respect the upper-tier government, so that if in fact there was opposition at those levels, there would be an opportunity for those people to be heard, and the municipality would have to comply with the wishes of those other elected officials.

We heard the government member stand up and say there are six criteria that have to be met, and we have bureaucrats down here at Queen's Park checking to make sure all these criteria are met.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** It was your criteria back in 1985.

**Mr Sterling:** Oh, I know. We had it back in the early—the Conservatives had it. The Conservative government is as guilty as the Liberal government and as the present government. It's past time that the provincial government is involved in these piddly-diddy decisions which it is. I agree that the criteria should be fulfilled, but why not put them, as the member has indicated, as regulations under this act, under section 9 of this bill, that the Lieutenant Governor can set down these criteria. That's what John Sewell's talking about. He's saying, "Let's have the decisions made at the local level on planning matters, under strict guidelines, where it's all outlined clearly so that decisions can be made

and can be made fast."

What I'm saying here is that planning decisions are, in a lot of ways, much more important than what Mr Jordan is asking this Legislature to approve, and if we can't hand down this, how are we ever going to hand down planning decisions to local municipalities to make the final decision?

I think this is the right step for government to take, and I predict that if it doesn't happen with Bill 46, it's going to happen in the next year or the next two years because, quite frankly, provincial bureaucrats shouldn't be involved, shouldn't be paid—we have a crisis at this time. The local people are much better judges of this kind of decision than you and I or any of the other members of this Legislature are, because we don't know what the local situation is.

Therefore, I strongly support Mr Jordan's bill. I hope the government will support it as well and look to improving the bill. I'm sure Mr Jordan is amenable to reasonable amendments to his whole idea. But the principle can be very strongly supported as a devolution of provincial business, to local municipalities, which is no longer needed to be dealt with by the province of Ontario.

**Mr White:** I have a great deal of agreement with the member opposite. In fact, most of my family, as Mr Sterling's family, comes from eastern Ontario. I believe that it's my great uncle's home which is a museum in Perth. The name of Drummond, of course, is famous from Perthshire in Scotland, but it's the other side of my family that in Ontario comes from Perth. As well, of course, I have relatives who have come from Gananoque, from Otonabee township, all in eastern Ontario, and with my family, my three children, we thoroughly enjoy the many museums, the many repositories of our family and our community's history throughout eastern Ontario.

They are supported very strongly by their communities. These are very important aspects of every community, I would think, in eastern Ontario and in northern Ontario. They are centres where the communities have supported and shown not only what our past was, but also remind us of what is relevant in our present lives of those past lives, and what will continue into the future. Proud traditions, Mr Speaker.

There's no question that I personally, or that our government, our ministries of Culture and Communications and Tourism, all those good governmental ministries, support those museums, and of course my own family connections to his riding. But this bill is not about museums; it's about municipalities; It's about bylaws, tax exemptions.

My friend the member for St Catharines-Brock illustrated the five very straightforward criteria that were set out, I remind Mr Sterling, during his government's



time. I won't go into those in great detail, but only indicate that the options a municipality has are very clear. If a municipality wishes to encourage museums in its jurisdiction, it can offer grants in kind, grants that would basically pay back the cost of property taxes that are paid by that institution. It can do that as a matter of a bylaw. It can do that as a matter of an order in that municipal council.

1140

The alternative to that, of course, is, as my friend would suggest, having a bylaw which would exempt it and having enabling power to do so. What would be the essential difference? I would suggest, to that institution, not much. We're talking a dollar from here or a dollar from there. It's the same dollar.

My friend has brought forth legislation which is, by the way, very similar to what the previous Liberal government had brought forward, had on the order paper in 1990. It basically set out those criteria, established those five criteria. Let me go over them and why they are important.

First of all, the organization owns and occupies the property: very simple, very obvious. It's silly to pass legislation or a bylaw that would exempt property or exempt an organization without those two things being common, that the museum is in that specific locality.

The organization is a registered charity under the Income Tax Act: again, very obvious. We have many museums, many facilities, like the Hiram Walker Museum, the Seagram Museum in Waterloo. Should that Seagram Museum, which is an important tourist facility in that community, be exempt? It also very clearly occupies a large space and also very clearly it's part of a commercial organization, part of a commercial concern. The idea is that one visits that facility. It's important to do so. It's important to that community. But it also is a means of ensuring the purchase of Seagram's products, frankly. So I'm sure my friend wouldn't argue with that point, that it should be a charitable organization.

The exemption should apply to property tax and not to other charges, such as local improvement: fair enough. The consent by the upper tier and the school board has to be obtained: As the former Chair of the regulations and private bills committee, I've certainly seen that happen time and again, where bills are brought forward by a member but the school board or the upper-tier municipality hasn't been involved, hasn't been consulted. It's a one-step shop.

Obviously, if you exempt something from property tax at one level, it has to be exempted at those other levels, at the upper-tier level, that's the regional level or the county level or the district level, or also the school board level. If you have property tax exemption, it's got to be across the board. That has to be secured and the exemption has to be granted through a municipal bylaw.

Those are terms which my friend says he'd like to see included in the regulations. Fair enough.

But when that was done in 1990, who objected? The Association of Municipalities of Ontario objected. They thought it was inappropriate to have those kind of exemptions. The Municipal Finance Officers' Association of Ontario also objected. The very organization which represents these municipalities did not like to see these property tax exemptions. There are a number of reasons behind that. We have bonusing, we have other kinds of issues that they might have seen as being of concern. Fair enough. That was 1990; that was three years ago.

But more recently, the property tax working group of the Fair Tax Commission, which is a central thrust to our government and I'm sure something which the member opposite would support, to have an improved property tax system, made the following recommendations: that local governments should not be given discretionary powers to exempt properties—again, we have the bonusing issue—but should have the power to provide grants. That's exactly what the Association of Municipalities of Ontario suggested. What a coincidence that we have such unanimity.

There should be a provincial exemption policy in legislation: My friend's policy in regards to museums is an excellent one, but it should be across the board. What should be defined and how should that be done? I would suggest that shouldn't be done in regulation; it should be done through public debate in this Legislature, not in a back-door kind of way after the fact.

We should have definitions of "cultural facilities" and "recreational facilities" so that those criteria can be met, they can be agreed upon and debated here in this House, not through a back-door procedure. The exemption should be attached to the use of the property rather than the owner. Well, that's the same thing as the criteria I mentioned before.

Since the Fair Tax Commission is expected to report at the end of this year, acting in this way would be, in support of my friend's bill, a way of opposing the introduction of significant reforms to property tax. For those reasons, I think we should do it in a holistic way, we should look at a range of processes, it should be a matter of law not a matter of regulation, and we should have full and open debate and include the municipalities, include the financial officers, include the ratepayers so that everyone would have the opportunity to speak on these important matters and not simply have it through a back-door, regulation means.

For those reasons, while I support fully the intent of my colleague's bill, I have very, very grave difficulty with some of the effects it would have. I would instead urge the members present to look at this kind of bill, these kinds of exemptions, as something that should happen as part of the property tax reform, as part of our

Fair Tax Commission's report, and therefore I would urge members present not to support my friend's bill.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Private members' hour frequently, in this House, gives us an opportunity to discuss our philosophical approach to some of the issues for debate that are brought forward by private members. I listened very carefully this morning to my colleagues as they debated and discussed this bill, which would give to local municipalities the right to exempt museums from their property tax base.

For those people who are listening in or who are here in gallery, the way it works today is that the provincial government is the one that has to give any municipal tax exemption. There's a long and complicated, actually very bureaucratic process that agencies or individuals have to go through if they want to either appeal their municipal tax or appeal to the provincial government in order to receive a tax-exempt status. You've heard some of that discussed this morning.

Rather than getting into the nitty-gritty of the discussion of the process, I would like to deal with the philosophy of what should the province of Ontario be doing and what should it not be doing any more. One of the problems we have is that many of the processes and procedures and structures and laws that were set up over many, many years by actually, I would say, primarily Conservative governments—and I don't say that in a partisan way, but it was the Conservative governments, over 40 years, that set up many of these processes and procedures. They adopted a philosophical, paternalistic, small-c conservative approach, which said: "We don't trust you municipalities to make these decisions. We will make them for you in Queen's Park."

What this legislation today does is to take one very small step by saying, and this is what my colleague Mr Jordan is saying, "We think municipalities should have the right to make a decision to exempt a museum from their tax base and give them tax-exempt status."

As I debate this, I would like to take a much broader look at this particular issue. I served on a local municipal council for six and a half years, from 1978 until 1985, and I understand the importance of local accountability for local decisions. I also understand the responsibility that municipal councils have today and in fact could have.

It's one of the reasons that I was so pleased in 1990 that the Liberal government at the time, under the Minister of Municipal Affairs, John Sweeney, tabled what was then Bill 229, which in fact gave to the municipal councils the authority, the responsibility, the accountability and effective control over municipal tax bases.

1150

What this legislation, Bill 229, actually did was go much further than what Mr Jordan is suggesting in this

legislation today. It took the principle which said, "Local responsibility, local decision-making and local accountability for local issues." This is a philosophical Liberal point of view that I believe, we believe, we believed in 1990 and I know that we still believe today, because our leader, Lyn McLeod, says it everywhere she goes.

We don't believe in one size fits all. We don't believe in command and control government. We believe that local municipal councils know what their municipal tax base has to support. They know and they understand that if they relieve certain non-profit organizations like museums, they will have to spread the cost over the rest of the municipal tax base. There are many, many examples of real unfairness happening in municipalities, but it's very different from one municipality to the next. The local councils are the ones that know how to respond to that and how to respond to it most appropriately.

I used to believe when I was on municipal council that one of the reasons voter turnout was often as low as it was is because the people in the municipalities who were voting for those local councillors didn't believe that any decisions the local municipality made really had any significance, because it could always appeal them to Queen's Park. You saw this in the Planning Act, you saw this in the municipal response to your municipal taxes, all of those sorts of things. There was always an appeal process to the provincial government, which was considered and called the senior level of government.

Those many, many steps often frustrated individuals. They wanted to know: "Who's making the decision? Who's responsible? Whom can I hold accountable and whom can I appeal to for a change?" What they found out was that they were sent frequently in one direction, frequently in another direction, and this kind of finger-pointing, one to the other, tended to drive people at the local municipal level round the bend. I would meet with people who were tremendously frustrated because they couldn't get a straight answer on who was going to make the decision and how this was going to be finalized. They had process after process after process that really ground them down.

Here we have a piece of legislation that says, "Allow municipalities to decide whether or not they want to allow their museums to be tax-exempt." I personally believe that the people, the men and women who are elected to local municipal councils, are fully capable of having the authority and the responsibility to make that decision, not only about museums but about many of the non-profit organizations and agencies supported by government, which they may well want to decide to exempt or not, as the situation arises.

I listened with great interest as my colleague from Durham went on with his list of the other things that



municipalities could do in the way of grants in lieu and so forth, and front door and back door analogies, as he announced that he was not going to support local empowerment. He was not going to support local authority, local responsibility. He was not going to support the municipal councils to be able to make sensible decisions about their own municipal tax base.

I was very, very disappointed, although I understand that is part of the NDP ideology and philosophy, which is central command and control. So I am not surprised to see him and other members of his caucus voting against this legislation, which would empower municipalities and see that you had the responsibility and the authority at the right place.

I'm very proud of the fact that our leader, Lyn McLeod, has been saying to people that we Liberals believe that local communities can solve their problems better than people sitting around a table at Queen's Park can. That's as simple as you can state it. The people in the local communities know what's going to make their community work better. They understand what the problems are and they know what the solutions are.

To have someone, whether it is a politician or a bureaucrat, in Queen's Park making a decision—one size fits all—and then imposing that on municipalities across the province or putting in place the kind of procedures and processes that are going to frustrate individual taxpayers further leads to the kind of alienation from government that we are all facing today.

We have an opportunity, because this is a debate in principle on a piece of legislation that is just one small step. It does not go as far as Bill 229 went in giving municipalities the local authority and responsibility to make decisions they are fully capable of making. I'm not saying it is without flaws and difficulty, Mr Speaker; it is. But this is a debate in principle, and in order to implement this kind of legislation it will take a study and a look at what the implications are for school boards and upper-tier municipalities. We have a model, a piece of legislation, Bill 229, that solved those problems.

The one thing I've learned from my years here at Queen's Park is that if you set your mind to change, you can change things. You can find all the reasons in the world for not changing anything, but if you decide that you want to reform a system which is simply not working, you can do it. So I take this opportunity to encourage members of government to think about this. I don't believe one size fits all, and I think this piece of legislation as proposed by Mr Jordan, while it is only one small step, is worthy of support in principle.

I hope we will see the government move beyond its ideology. I would ask them to consider, when they talk about partnership with municipalities, that municipalities have elected representatives, representatives who are willing to be responsible and accountable to their

electorate, and that this government could stop trying to solve every problem in the Premier's office and let municipalities and the communities of this province get to the table and solve their own problems.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Lanark-Renfrew has two minutes in summary.

**Mr Jordan:** The comments from my colleagues I very much appreciate: my colleague from Carleton, my colleagues from Brant-Haldimand and from Durham.

The members have certainly pointed out the need for this bill. They've also pointed out that this bill does not stand alone. It is definitely to be known as enabling legislation. It enables a municipality to pass legislation at that level that would exempt non-profit museums.

As I've stated earlier, across the riding of Lanark-Renfrew we have 15 such museums which do not have the money to come here to Toronto and get a private bill through each time to be able to exempt that museum from tax. These museums, whether it be the Rideau Canal museum, the Smith's Falls Railway Museum, the Perth Museum—all of these museums are staffed and funded basically by volunteers. Sometimes during the peak season we require staff, that is, paid staff.

I just want to impress on all members this morning that I would like to see this bill pass as enabling legislation to be referred to the committee on general government on second reading. On that basis, then, these minor items of authority and the regulations that will come under the Lieutenant Governor could be looked into.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT (SEXUAL ORIENTATION), 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LE CODE DES DROITS DE LA PERSONNE (ORIENTATION SEXUELLE)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** We will now proceed with ballot item number 17, second reading of Bill 45, Mr Murphy's bill.

Are there any members opposed to having a vote on this bill? If so, please rise. Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of Mr Murphy's bill please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. A five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1201 to 1206.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Would all members please take their seats.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want to indicate at this time, before a vote is taken on second reading, that it is my intention, regardless of how the vote turns out, to raise whether or not this bill is in order because of the fact of

our Constitution not allowing a private member's bill on expenditures from the general revenue fund.

**The Acting Speaker:** We are now dealing with ballot item number 17, Mr Murphy's Bill 45.

All those in favour of Mr Murphy's bill, please rise and remain standing until identified by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Akande, Boyd, Caplan, Carter, Charlton, Churley, Cooper, Curling, Drainville, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Huget, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Kormos, Kwinter, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Marchese, Martin, Mathysen, McLeod, Morrow, Murdock (Sudbury), Murphy, O'Connor, Owens, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Swarbrick, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winner.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. All those opposed to Mr Murphy's bill, please rise and remain standing until named by the Clerk.

**Nays**

Callahan, Carr, Cousens, Cunningham, Daigeler, Eddy, Hayes, Jordan, Runciman, Sterling, Tilson, Turnbull, Witmer.

**The Acting Speaker:** The ayes are 43; the nays 13. I therefore declare the bill carried. Shall the bill be ordered for committee of the whole House?

**Interjections:** Justice committee.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have a majority in favour of the justice committee? Agreed. The bill will go to justice.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In view of the comments from the member for Carleton concerning a private member's bill causing the expenditure of funds or a reduction in revenues, I wonder if, while you're looking at Bill 45, which he asked you to do, you'll also look at Bill 46, standing in the name of Mr Jordan, which calls for tax exemptions.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT  
(TAX EXEMPTIONS), 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LES MUNICIPALITÉS  
(EXONÉRATION D'IMPÔTS)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** We will now deal with ballot item number 18. Are there any members opposed to a vote on ballot item number 18? If so, please stand.

All those in favour of second reading of Mr Jordan's Bill 46 please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried. Shall the bill be ordered for committee of the whole?

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** I ask that the bill be referred to the standing committee on general government.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have a majority for the general government committee? In my opinion, we do not have a majority. The bill shall therefore be ordered to committee of the whole.

That completes private members' business for this morning. This House will reconvene at 1:30.

The House recessed at 1212.



## AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

## ZENA AND LEON KOSSAR

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** Members are undoubtedly aware of the existence this week of the wonderful world of Metro Toronto International Caravan. Indeed, there are only four days left to take in the incredible cultural sights and sounds, tastes and traditions of Caravan.

Caravan was founded 25 years ago by Zena Kossar in order to showcase the various historic and cultural traditions and accomplishments of many of our communities. Since then, Caravan has become a unique nine-day international festival representing over 30 countries and 40 pavilions. But above all Festival Caravan is about our future, as it enhances, prepares and elevates our young people to perform on other stages in the arts, opera, show business, ballet and music.

Today I'm sure members will join me in extending heartfelt congratulations to Zena and Leon Kossar as they celebrate their 25th anniversary of Caravan. Organizing a festival of this magnitude and truly placing the whole world on stage needs boundless energy, patience and certainly a love of people. Our celebrants today are more than deserving of our recognition, since Festival Caravan brings out the best in us, respecting, sharing and caring for each other's cultures. So I say today, Zena and Leon, we are proud of you. Congratulations.

## CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** During a CBC radio interview on April 27, the Minister of Natural Resources said that grants to conservation authorities would be cut by 10%. This statement was blatantly incorrect. Grants were in fact cut by 21.4%.

As illustrated to me by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority, the MNR's position is extreme and shortsighted. I wonder if the minister is even aware that the conservation authorities operate according to the calendar year, because they were four months into the fiscal year when the axe fell. They had to slash their budgets by 32% for 1993.

Yesterday the Minister of Natural Resources finally responded, granting the conservation authorities a small concession. They can now use \$2 million from their capital budgets to pay property taxes.

Mr Speaker, you and I realize this concession is an inadequate, short-term fix. There is still an outstanding \$1.6 million needed to pay taxes, conservation land will still have to be auctioned off and the minister has done nothing to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive land in the future.

I ask the minister to abide by our resolution, which

was passed by this House, to renew the tax rebate and protect land that has been serviced by our local authorities for 50 years.

## BEREAN COMMUNITY HOUSING

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** Recently I had the honour of participating in a celebration to mark the official opening of Berean Community Housing in Sarnia. This affordable housing project was developed under the federal-provincial non-profit housing program and the Ontario Ministry of Housing is proud to be a financial partner in this program.

But more importantly, these wonderful homes became a reality because of the hard work and dedication of the Sarnia-Lambton Berean Community Housing group. This sponsoring group knew the needs of our community, and their support and efforts have paid off. They have made it possible for 73 individuals or families to live in secure, affordable housing.

This is a lasting investment in our community. This investment has also created jobs in construction and other related industries.

I would like to take this opportunity to again congratulate the members for their hard work and their vision of housing for the people in our community. The Sarnia-Lambton Berean Community Housing group is headed up by President Emerson Turner. I would also like to recognize the architect, J.P. Thompson Associates, and the contractor, D. Grant and Sons, for their important contribution to this impressive development.

I give my very best wishes to the residents of Berean Community Housing and thank them again for allowing me to participate in their celebration.

## MATH TREK

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** For some time, teachers and school boards have been under heavy attack by the public for an alleged failure to provide up-to-date education. Today, however, I have a real good-news story that shows how our educators continue to give great leadership in education despite some of the criticism that has been levelled against them. These days, I feel we too often overlook the good work that is being done by our teachers, administrators and trustees.

Two weeks ago, the Carleton Roman Catholic Separate School Board in my area launched a computer software program called Math Trek. Math Trek was developed in partnership with Iconix International, a division of the Unisys computer company.

Board officials say this is the most ambitious software project ever undertaken by a North American school board. It is designed to teach math skills to any student no matter what skill level they're at. So perhaps there's hope for us as well. Students go at their own pace and can repeat questions until they get the right

answers. Computer-generated graphics help kids visualize abstract concepts. The product is being marketed around the world and a home learning version will be available soon.

This is truly good news and I congratulate all the teachers and board officials who have worked on this innovative project for three years.

#### ORANGEVILLE KINSMEN

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I rise in the Legislature today to honour the dedication and work of the Orangeville Kinsmen service club within my riding of Dufferin-Peel.

The Kinsmen Club of Orangeville is celebrating 35 years of service to the town of Orangeville and surrounding area. The Kin clubs of Orangeville have organized and participated in many events that have raised awareness for numerous causes and held fund-raisers and special activities that help make our community special.

Recently, the Orangeville Kin clubs orchestrated a radiothon promoting cystic fibrosis research. Nationally, Kin clubs across Canada have been fund-raising for cystic fibrosis since 1964. To date, they have raised over \$20 million towards CF research.

They also run a variety of fund-raising activities throughout the year. The money goes towards many worthwhile causes, including playground equipment for parks within our community, Family Transition Place, Big Brothers, the Heart and Stroke Foundation, the March of Dimes, Boy Scouts, the Dufferin Area Hospital and many other worthwhile causes.

This year, they have agreed to take on organizing the Orangeville Santa Claus parade, which has grown to become a huge success and a big project.

I would like to offer the Orangeville Kinsmen Club all the best during their 35th anniversary and wish them well in their next 35 years.

#### ST THOMAS OF VILLANOVA SECONDARY SCHOOL

**Mr George Dadamo (Windsor-Sandwich):** In September 1993, St Thomas of Villanova high school will open its doors to about 800 students very enthusiastic about entering into their own domain.

I'll explain. For the past five years, these students have been patiently awaiting the opportunity to have somewhere they could call their very own. For the past five years, they have been sharing lockers, gymnasiums, classrooms, fields and everything else that a student should have available to him or her.

St Thomas of Villanova will attract students from seven municipalities and hopefully achieve around 1,300 in the next few years. The school is situated at the northwest corner of County Road 8 and Disputed Road in the town of LaSalle.

The school will have baseball diamonds, soccer

fields, a running track and a triple gymnasium which can be combined into one large facility for community use as well. The classrooms will be well lit, the façade dominated by a tree of life and a huge stained glass window donated by the Basilian religious order.

#### 1340

Appreciation should be given to the teachers and student bodies in the past years at General Amherst, in Amherstburg, for their kindness and generosity. A sharing of school facilities was the order of the day; two student systems rolled into one was not easy to attain, yet they accomplished that.

I was able to visit the school on two different occasions and saw, at first hand, sharing in action. Principals of both schools certainly had their hands full in making sure the two student bodies worked well together.

I congratulate the teachers, students and parents at St Thomas of Villanova, as you have worked hard to attain your own facilities. Much success in the coming years, and we will see you at the ribbon-cutting ceremonies.

#### BICYCLING SAFETY

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Mary Javadimatis is a grade 5 student at Forest Manor Public School in my riding of Oriole.

Recently, Mary's grade 5 class was visited by Officer Phil of the Metropolitan Toronto Police department to discuss bicycle safety. Mary's class was informed about the importance of operating bicycles safely.

Officer Phil took the time to tell Mary and her classmates that they need not only ride safely, watching out for cars, pedestrians and other bikers, but they also have to have a bicycle that is safe itself. They were told the importance of wearing a bicycle helmet and ensuring that their bicycles are equipped with reflectors and mirrors.

Mary says that when she purchased her bicycle, these safety features were not included in the purchase price. Mary believes that the law in Ontario should require retailers to include standard safety features and devices when they sell their bikes. Mary points out, however, that the cost of buying reflectors, helmets and mirrors separately can add up to a big expense. She realizes the cost of purchasing reflectors, helmets and mirrors can really add a lot to the cost of a bicycle.

Perhaps bicycle manufacturers could try harder to make bicycles that are both safe and affordable. With bicycles becoming ever more popular, I believe that Mary's suggestion that safety features be mandatory on children's bicycles certainly warrants serious consideration by the Minister of Transportation.

#### CONTINUING EDUCATION AWARDS

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** On Tuesday, June 15, 1993, I had the privilege of speaking at the continuing education awards banquet at Ryerson Polytechnic University.



Each year outstanding students are honoured for their academic achievement and contributions outside of work or school. On Tuesday, more than 20 students were honoured for their dedication and perseverance. Many of the award winners were parents raising young families. Their commitment to education has enabled them to maintain a high academic standing, and they have made time in their busy lives to contribute to the community. We were all very proud of their achievements.

Four teachers were also granted awards. They were nominated by their students for being enthusiastic, stimulating and having the ability to motivate students.

On behalf of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, I would like to congratulate the award winners for their courage and determination. We are certain they will be leaders in their communities.

I would also like to congratulate Brent Bowes, president of the Continuing Education Students' Association of Ryerson, for a most successful year, and thank Diana McLaren for inviting me to be part of the celebration. I was honoured to be the first guest speaker at an official function at Ryerson Polytechnic University and congratulate President Terrence Grier for his leadership.

I was also given this T-shirt as a gift. I'm not going to wear it in the House.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Better declare it. It's worth more than \$200.

**Mrs Cunningham:** I won't wear this in the House, as I can see the Premier staring at me right now. He also wants me to declare it. He says it's over \$200, but I'm sure they will, next year, have "Polytechnic University" on their T-shirts.

#### GRIMSBY HAPPENING-IN-THE-PARK

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise today to tell the House about a very exciting and entertaining festival that will take place in my riding this Sunday, June 27: Grimsby's annual Happening-in-the-Park.

Sunny skies or grey, Grimsby will always come alive as approximately 5,000 people converge on Centennial Park to celebrate Canada's 126th birthday a few days early.

From 1 pm, the park will be packed with musicians, dancers, food booths, bands, a barbershop quartet and a world-famous jump rope team called the Lincoln Leapers. Also, there will be horseshoe and Nintendo competitions—which my son won two years ago—a rugby game, balloon sculpting and a display at the Grimsby Art Gallery. At 9:45 pm, a 10-minute fireworks show will end the celebration.

I'm sure this year's Happening-in-the-Park will bring together the entire community of Grimsby, and it will attract visitors from other parts of the Niagara Peninsula, Metro Toronto and the United States. I would like

to congratulate the organizers of Grimsby's 21st annual Happening-in-the-Park for coming up with a unique way of promoting their community.

I urge members of this House and their constituents to come on down to my riding this Sunday and experience another wonderful Happening-in-the-Park, and if you're coming, please bring some sunshine.

#### BIRTHDAYS

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege. I probably haven't got a point of privilege, but nevertheless I'm going to ask the House to join with me in early birthday wishes to a friend and colleague, the Minister of Labour, Bob Mackenzie, who on Saturday will be 65. He's bashful and he didn't want me to say anything about it, but it's a milestone that deserves some recognition, and I ask our friends to applaud.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Not only does the member for Durham East not have a point of privilege, but should any other member rise to indicate that the member for Ottawa East is also celebrating his birthday today, that would not be a point of privilege either.

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: There is a gentleman in Ottawa called Jean Charest who is also having a birthday today.

#### LEGISLATIVE PAGES

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** I have an unusual request of the Speaker, and I seek unanimous consent of the House. It seems that this is the last day for our pages. They're quite a creative group. They've asked if they could break with traditions of the House and sing a song they've written, which will take about two minutes. If there is unanimous consent, now might be an appropriate time for them to do that.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Are we agreed? Agreed. Get your group together.

*The pages sang.*

**The Speaker:** Super. Thank you. I must thank the member for Oriole. Indeed, I was going to say that as this is the last day for our current group of pages, I would like to express on behalf of all the members how deeply we appreciate the service that you have provided with such distinction to our chamber and to our members. Thank you very, very much for everything you've done.

1350

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

##### FÊTE DE LA SAINT-JEAN-BAPTISTE

**L'hon Gilles Pouliot (ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones) :** C'est aujourd'hui le jour de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste, une journée très importante pour tous les Canadiens français de tout le pays.

La Saint-Jean, c'est depuis près de 150 ans une occasion pour la francophonie canadienne de se fêter. Ce qui était au début une occasion de célébrer le jour le plus long de l'année est devenu, au fil des ans, un moyen pour les francophones de l'Ontario et du reste du Canada de célébrer leur joie de vivre.

Aujourd'hui, des célébrations auront lieu partout à travers la province pour célébrer la Saint-Jean, entre autres, à Ottawa, au Franco, un événement qui attire à chaque année plus d'un demi-million de personnes et qui se termine ce soir par un festival haut en couleur.

À Toronto, à la Place Ontario, vous pourrez assister ce soir à un spectacle mettant en vedette Robert Charlebois et Mette Gabo. D'autres activités auront lieu, bien sûr, à Sudbury et aussi dans la ville de Welland.

Saint-Jean-Baptiste is a special occasion for francophones to celebrate their culture, and I invite all Ontarians to celebrate with the francophone community. Keep in mind that you don't have to be a francophone to "partager," to join in our joie de vivre. Bonne Saint-Jean-Baptiste à tous.

**M. Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa-Est) :** Comme vient de le mentionner le ministre responsable des Affaires francophones, aujourd'hui en Ontario, comme partout au Canada, les francophones fêtent des siècles de détermination tranquille à survivre et à prospérer. Je veux leur souhaiter la plus heureuse des Saint-Jean-Baptiste.

À Hearst, comme à Windsor, à Prescott et Russell, à Ottawa, à Toronto et à bien d'autres endroits dans la province, ils se rassemblent et se disent qu'ils sont fiers de ce qu'ils sont. Ils se disent qu'ils se souviennent.

Ce qui me rend encore plus fier, c'est de voir qu'il y a de plus en plus de Canadiens non francophones qui se sentent proches de notre culture, qui se laissent, avec une grande joie, emporter par la fièvre qui est dans le cœur de tous les Canadiens d'expression française le 24 juin.

Beaucoup de mes collègues se sont déjà joints aux festivités entourant la Saint-Jean-Baptiste. Samedi, Lyn McLeod et le groupe parlementaire d'Ottawa-Carleton vont faire une visite sur le site du Festival Franco-Ontarien à Ottawa. Nous avons tous hâte de prendre un bain de francophonie dans une atmosphère de gaieté sur un très beau site.

Demain, je vais avoir le très grand plaisir de participer à l'inauguration officielle d'une peinture murale réalisée par un artiste francophone, Pierre Hardy. Cette peinture murale s'intitule «Hommage aux Franco-Ontariens», et elle retrace les grands moments de l'histoire franco-ontarienne. Ses dimensions imposantes sont à l'image de la contribution de la communauté franco-ontarienne à la vie de cette province. Je réfléchissais à propos de l'oeuvre de Pierre Hardy et je me suis dit qu'une telle peinture murale était importante à cette

étape ici de notre histoire. Je félicite ceux qui en ont eu l'idée.

Encore aujourd'hui, le travail acharné des personnes de notre histoire doit nous servir d'exemple. Prenons l'exemple de la ténacité de Jeanne Lajoie, du sens de l'innovation du père Thériault, d'Alphonse Desjardins, du sens des affaires de Lise Desjardins, de Jean-Guy Desjardins et de Delcourt Soucy. Inspirons-nous aussi du révérend père Charlebois, qui a fondé le journal *Le Droit*. Ces gens-là et bien d'autres, avec l'aide d'une population courageuse et toujours prête à aider, nous ont donné des instruments d'épanouissement et nous indiquent la marche à suivre.

J'aimerais qu'un jour, on retrouve des peintures murales comme celle dont je vous parle partout dans la province. J'aimerais qu'un jour, elles relatent l'histoire d'un peuple qui, à force de sa ténacité, s'est donné des instruments qui lui ont permis de devenir une force économique, une influence culturelle importante, un partenaire à part entière.

Nul ne peut mettre en doute la richesse, l'importance et la contribution de la communauté franco-ontarienne. Pierre Hardy s'en est inspiré pour produire une superbe peinture murale qui sera inaugurée demain, et je voudrais qu'elle serve à nous rassembler, car il y a encore beaucoup à faire.

Je veux vous dire aujourd'hui combien je suis fier d'être né Franco-Ontarien et combien j'ai confiance qu'un jour, tous les miens pourront s'épanouir pleinement dans une province et un pays où règne l'harmonie entre tous les peuples.

#### HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I'm really pleased to join the minister, obviously, in congratulating our Franco-Ontarians on Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day. But I would have thought that the minister, as Minister of Transportation, would also have repeated the statement he made to the public this morning on private sector involvement in Highway 407. If he had made that statement, I would have welcomed the Premier as a latter-day convert to private sector principles. I would have said better late than never, and I would have said, "Yes, Minister, we're quite prepared to welcome and to see how the private sector is going to come forward and bid on the 407, and get it constructed earlier. We certainly agree that the jobs are needed and we want a shovel in the ground."

I would have also said to the minister that he's been, so far, minister of announcements rather than Minister of Transportation. Frankly, we've seen a lot of announcements and a lot of promises but very, very little action. He's been a very good showman, there's no question about that: I think he could have joined the pages, who were singing to us a little bit earlier. But what we want to see in this province, Minister, and I say to the Premier, is action. We don't want to see only



announcements. Secondly, we certainly want to see the details of the bid that is being put forward by the private sector. I congratulate the private sector on taking the initiative on this, but we want to see the details, as we wanted to see on the social contract legislation.

#### FÊTE DE LA SAINT-JEAN-BAPTISTE

**M. Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & Grenville-Est) :** Il me fait aussi plaisir de me joindre à mes collègues pour ajouter mes vœux de la Saint-Jean, que ce soit à nos francophones, à nos francophiles ou même à ceux qui sont assez chanceux d'avoir épousé une ou un francophile ou francophone.

Aujourd'hui, les Canadiens et les Canadiennes d'expression française célèbrent, à travers le pays, la Saint-Jean-Baptiste. De nombreuses activités et célébrations sont à l'horaire du jour pour nos Franco-Ontariens et nos Franco-Ontariennes. La Saint-Jean-Baptiste est une journée pour les Franco-Ontariens et les Franco-Ontariennes de réfléchir sur notre culture française, sur la richesse de notre langue et sur la francophonie canadienne, un peuple fondateur dans notre pays, notre beau et grand pays du Canada.

Le beau temps est avec nous pour célébrer aujourd'hui. Au nom de mon parti, nous vous souhaitons tous, Canadiens et Canadiennes d'expression française, une bonne et heureuse Saint-Jean-Baptiste.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker:** Before proceeding, I would invite all members to welcome to our chamber this afternoon, and seated in the members' gallery east, the Honourable Eldon Lautermilch, who is an MLA from Saskatchewan. Welcome to our chamber this afternoon.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### TRANSFER PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier. Quite clearly we do not believe that the legislation that passed second reading yesterday is good legislation and we do not believe that it will achieve the goals of restraint.

As local municipalities, school boards, hospitals and colleges and universities now sit down to try and figure out how they're going to implement Bill 48, they're finding indeed that the legislation is unworkable. For one example, the city of Mississauga has been told that its transfers will be reduced by \$6.3 million under the social contract. But when they add up the kinds of cuts that are proposed in the fail-safe provisions of Bill 48, including the wage freezes, including the full 12 days of unpaid leave, when they factor in the protection of workers under \$30,000, they find they can save only \$4.5 million. Bill 48's provisions leave that particular municipality with a \$1.8-million shortfall.

Premier, I suggest to you that people at the local level know that they have to work with the cuts you have imposed, but they truly believe they can come up

with better solutions. I ask, why do you not understand that your broad-brush, fail-safe provisions are just not workable? Why will you not give the transfer partners the freedom they need to find solutions at the local level to the cuts you're imposing on them?

1400

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Partners who want to negotiate and talk with each other have absolutely no reason to rely on the fail-safe provisions, and I would have thought that the member would have understood that by this point. The whole purpose of having negotiations is to allow for places like Mississauga to sit down with people and to work out local solutions.

I should tell the honourable member that you're looking at a city, the city of Mississauga, which is, I would think, one of the two or three wealthiest municipalities in Ontario, indeed in all of Canada, and if you're telling me there isn't the capacity within Mississauga to find solutions to these problems, I'm sorry, I just can't accept that, and I would be very surprised if it's now the position of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition that the city of Mississauga or indeed other parts of the province don't have the capacity to do that.

#### Interjections.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I hear the heckling from the other side, and I would say directly to her that the policies we've followed in terms of trying to work out with the municipalities and with others the means of dealing with these issues have been very constructive policies. The meeting I had with AMO, the meeting I had which was attended by a number of representatives of municipalities, including the mayor of Hamilton, Bob Morrow, indicated very clearly that they were interested in working with the government, they supported the government's efforts in terms of the general, broad direction of what we were trying to do and they realized that it was much more constructive to sit down and try to work these things out than to do it in a climate of confrontation or a climate in which people's expectations were simply that one sector was blamed or one group of people or another was blamed. I'm only sorry and I truly regret that the Liberal opposition has chosen to take a completely different tack from the one that most of the other social partners have chosen to take.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** We're not getting that response from the universities, we're not getting that response from the hospitals, we're not getting it from the municipalities. We're getting it from a Liberal opposition which doesn't know what to do except to stand up and say, "No, no, no; oppose, oppose, oppose," day in, day out. That's the only thing you know how to do.

**Mrs McLeod:** My frustration is that if the Premier

really believed all that he just said in response to my question, he would listen seriously to what I'm asking, because the legislation that he has put in place stands as a barrier to people at the local level who do have the capacity to find solutions and who want to find solutions, who have been ready to work with you. We have always argued that local agreements were the better way to go and, quite frankly, two weeks ago I thought you understood that as well.

It is apparent that in this process of having to reach sectoral agreements, that is going to prove to be an impossibility for many groups. In fact, I thought you understood that for people like CUPE, it simply doesn't have an executive which is in power to negotiate on behalf of the local unions, nor are the education associations empowered to negotiate on behalf of their particular employee groups.

That is why we are arguing that the approach, the process in your legislation is impossible to implement. We believe that local agreements can be reached, and we hear at the local level over and over again that people are anxious to get on with it.

But your legislation, as we read your legislation, provides the incentive of a 20% reduction in savings targets only if a sectoral agreement is reached before a local agreement. Therefore, if there are local solutions that can be found and if they are better solutions, the people who reach those solutions are going to be penalized.

I'm asking you very directly, why does your legislation penalize the local employers and employees who do work hard to get an agreement, who do believe they have the capacity to find better solutions? Since the real implementation of the cuts is going to depend on those local negotiations, why will you not extend the 20% savings incentive to any local negotiations and agreements that are reached between employers and employees whether or not a sectoral agreement is reached?

**Hon Mr Rae:** If the Liberal Party, having opposed this legislation, is now saying it wants to move amendments, I can only say those amendments would be fairly and duly considered. The whole purpose of what we're doing at the local level is to encourage people to sit down and negotiate and to encourage people to find local solutions and to provide an incentive for doing so. If the leader of the Liberal Party is finally realizing that that in fact is what the act does and that the act has responded very carefully to what we've been asked to do by the municipalities, what we were asked to do by the universities, then we will respond.

But if she is now saying that she's got some positive, constructive amendments to propose, having resisted the entire purpose of the legislation and having voted against the legislation in principle and indicating that the Liberal Party doesn't care about restraint—because

if you cared about restraint you would have voted for the legislation in principle like everybody else recognizes it around here—then that's fine.

If you've now changed your tune and you've now changed your position because you know how untenable your position now is, that would be fine, and we'll deal with those amendments next week; when it comes to committee of the whole we'll deal with them.

**Mrs McLeod:** That is pure and simple misrepresentation of the position that this caucus and I have taken from the very beginning of this process. I say to this Premier, if he will cast his mind back and even pull out Hansard and read it, that when he made a statement that he understood, having listened to municipalities, that the broad-brush approach wouldn't work, I said: "Premier, I am glad you have understood that. We are relieved that you are going to take some action." And then we saw the legislation that they brought in, which makes it more difficult. We are opposed to legislation which makes it even more difficult for local people to arrive at local solutions, and the Premier's refusal to answer the question that I just asked is a clear indication that this government is not truly ready to look at how you can facilitate local solutions to the cuts you've imposed.

I would suggest that all that the Premier has done for the last two weeks is add more and more confusion to a process that is taking place right now. I am encouraging a process, and have from the beginning, of local negotiations to deal with the financial targets you put in place. I have said to you what I hear from municipalities and others, that they cannot any longer achieve your full-year 5% reduction in the six months that they have left, and they hear you saying, "That's what has to be done," even though you seem to be saying something else. They get confused when they sit down at a negotiating table and hear the Premier saying, "Well, there are special factors that are going to be taken into account, there are exemptions that will be made," and they have no idea what those are or how they should apply for them.

I am saying to you today, if you really want those negotiations to succeed, take the steps to make that possible, put some clear guidelines in place, let people at the local level get on with it, tell them what the time lines are, tell them what the exemptions are, tell them what the special factors are, let them get on with the job.

**Hon Mr Rae:** In listening to the Leader of the Opposition, it's hard to know whether she got off the fence deliberately or whether she just fell off the fence. It's very hard to know; it's hard to tell the difference.

I would say to her very directly, what the Liberal Party has been saying for the last three months is, "Oppose, oppose, oppose." They have said nothing that would encourage people to come to the table; they have said nothing that would encourage people to find local



solutions. Every time there's been an expenditure reduction, they have encouraged everyone to resist it and everyone to reject it. They have said nothing in this House that would indicate that they care a fig about expenditure reduction. Now, the day after the legislation is passed on second reading, she says, "Oh, how about this amendment or that amendment?" All I can say is that the Liberal Party has demonstrated that it is a party that knows how to oppose something and knows how to say no and knows how to resist something and knows how to obstruct something. You do not know how to build.

This party is building. We are building for a better Ontario, and you're trying to tear it down and tear it up, and that's what we've seen in the last three months.

**Mrs McLeod:** If I thought the Premier really wanted to hear the alternatives, I would willingly take the time to put together two months of daily questions in this Legislature and send them to him.

Premier, I say to you finally, because you refuse to acknowledge that I had even asked the question, that when you do not give the incentive to those who reach local agreements, you are penalizing those who are ready to work at a local level to find your solutions.

#### HYDRO RATES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I have another question, Premier, on the social contract, related to the fact that the social contract negotiators have just recently announced that the targeted savings under the contract for municipal electric utilities across the province will total \$23 million. The municipal electric utilities receive no funding at all from the province.

Again, this is an issue which we have raised before in the House; this is not the first time. We didn't just discover it after your legislation passed second reading.

But the municipal electric utilities receive no funding from the province. Their revenues all come from local consumers, and I ask you once again, why should local hydro ratepayers be asked to help cover your debt?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'm going to refer this to the Minister of Environment and Energy.

1410

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** As I understand it, at the sectoral table, at the municipal table, this matter has been canvassed extensively, and the position taken by the utilities, the municipalities and the negotiators for the province is that any saving accruing from agreements from the municipal electric utilities will be credited against the targets required by the municipalities. The utilities themselves will benefit because of course their compensation packages will be reduced and the municipalities will benefit in that their targets will be lower.

**Mrs McLeod:** I wonder if you also thoroughly

canvassed the issue that the negotiators have confirmed that Hydro as a provincial utility is being asked to contribute \$100 million to the social contract under Bill 48—and once again, as with the municipal electric utilities, Ontario Hydro receives no government grants.

Let me just make the point very clearly: The reason we continue to raise this as one of our specific concerns with the social contract cuts is that everybody is affected by this. Everybody uses electricity, whether it is the unemployed worker, whether it is the single-parent family, whether it is the small business person or the large corporation. Therefore, the \$100 million you are now asking Hydro to pay to the social contract, in our minds, constitutes a hidden tax on consumers. I want to ask you, how much do you think consumers will be expected to pay in increased hydro rates as a result of this \$100-million hit?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member should know that we have made a commitment as a government, and the corporation, the board of directors, has also made a commitment, that there will be a freeze in rates in 1994, and subsequent to that, the rates will climb only at or below inflation. We are confident, because Ontario Hydro has already initiated restructuring and talks with its employees, that a significant contribution will be made to the saving and the restructuring in the public sector of the province by Ontario Hydro and that this can be done within the context of the commitments on rates.

**Mrs McLeod:** Thank you, Minister, for providing the preamble to my final supplementary, because that is exactly why we've asked the question.

Hydro did already undertake its own work on its own social contract, because it announced last March that it was going to lay off as many as 4,000 people; because it was trying to get its own debt under control; because it had made a commitment to freeze its rates. As we understand it, Ontario Hydro's revenues last year totalled about \$7.7 billion. This is our own calculation—I'd be happy to have you confirm or deny it—but that means to us that the \$100 million you have asked Hydro to pay to you under the social contract talks could mean a rate increase of up to 1.2%.

My question is, how can Hydro keep its commitment to its wage freeze when it has to absorb this new \$100-million hit that you've imposed on it? Surely you would think Ontario Hydro has a large enough debt of its own to worry about.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Ontario Hydro is already involved in restructuring, in making savings for the people of this province and for business, and to make us more competitive. It's unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition, when she was Minister of Energy, didn't take action to deal with Hydro's debt and deal with the overbilling of Ontario Hydro by that government.

## YORK DETENTION CENTRE

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question is to the Premier. Yesterday in the House, I raised an issue regarding accusations of a coverup, where employees at the York Detention Centre approached senior managers within the Ministry of Community and Social Services and that their efforts to seek justice were thwarted.

I'm sending you over two letters, one addressed to Marion Boyd, dated July 31, 1992. I understand she is now your Attorney General, but she was the Comsoc minister at the time, and the details of this coverup and the senior civil servants responsible for it are contained in this letter. I also have a letter from Mrs Boyd which indicates, "I have asked my senior staff for a full report on the actions taken to address your concerns." I'd like to send that over to the Premier.

Yesterday your current Minister of Community and Social Services indicated that the matter had been referred to the Attorney General's office. You would be aware that in accordance with the Ontario Public Service Act there is a protocol for cases of sexual harassment or sexual assault and that this matter would have gone through the normal channels and gone to the Human Resources Secretariat. The person responsible for the Human Resources Secretariat at that time was Tony Silipo. The person who was under review, or the ministry under review, was Mrs Boyd as the Comsoc minister. Now she is your Attorney General.

My question to you is, if the police are now interested in knowing if there's been an obstruction of justice for those employees in the Comsoc ministry and this matter's been referred to the Attorney General, how can the Attorney General investigate her actions of a year ago and her ministry?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would first of all refer the member and refer the Speaker to section 23(g)(i) of the standing orders and would refer any question to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

**Mr Jackson:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In accordance with our standing orders, I wish to advise the House that in accordance with the Ministry of the Attorney General's act, chapter M17, subsection 5(a), "The Attorney General is the law officer of the executive council." It goes on to say that they shall see that the administration of public affairs is done in accordance with the law.

My point is that this matter cannot be referred by the Premier, because all the people he would refer to are currently involved in the examination as to whether there's been an obstruction of justice. There is—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the member for Burlington South take his seat. There are two matters here. First, all members should be aware that we should not be asking questions which are related

directly to cases which are currently before the court where there are criminal charges. It is not possible for the Chair to always know which items indeed fall into that category.

Secondly, however, a question posed to a minister and indeed the Premier can be referred to any other minister under the standing orders. The question's been referred to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Minister?

**Mr Jackson:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Nowhere in my question was I raising the issue of the criminal charges against the rapist. I raised the question of an investigation that is being undertaken by the Attorney General's office. At least the Premier should have referred it to the Attorney General.

**The Speaker:** The member will note that I did not disallow his question. Instead, I said that it was perfectly in order for the Premier to redirect, which in fact is what he did. The Minister of Community and Social Services.

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** Yesterday in my answer to the member I outlined the actions that had been taken by officials within the Ministry of Community and Social Services to encourage women who felt they had been sexually harassed or assaulted to come forward and to give that information to the police. I'm confident that has happened. The operations review that is under way will tell us in a fuller way the extent to which that or has not happened. On that score, everything that I believe should have been done has been done.

The member, I think, made some comments as well with respect to the time that I was Chair of Management Board. I don't think that I need to answer this point, given that I'm no longer in that capacity, but I think for the record I would want to tell him that as far as I can recall none of these issues were brought to my attention when I was Chair of Management Board.

1420

**Mr Jackson:** The minister's statements confirm the very notion that we're dealing with a coverup. The Ontario Public Service Act is very clear.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Rubbish.

**Mr Jackson:** Well, the Premier says, "Rubbish," and he hides his head. I am telling you, Premier, there's nothing rubbish about this.

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the member direct his question to the chair, please.

**Mr Jackson:** The Ontario Public Service Act is there to protect employees from sexual harassment. There is a protocol upheld by this government to ensure that those employees get some form of redress and justice. The fact that this minister can stand in the House and say that it was never before him in his capacity with the Human Resources Secretariat confirms



that the information contained in these letters was thwarted and never passed through the regular channels in accordance with the laws of Ontario. I ask the minister why then, if you were the minister responsible, and you are now the Minister for Community and Social Services, were these matters not sent through to the Human Resources Secretariat on a matter as serious as the rape of employees in provincial institutions and sexual harassment that was ongoing in these provincial institutions? Why was it allowed to be stopped from going to you, as the minister responsible for the Human Resources Secretariat?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** My understanding, and I'm not sure in what simple language it is possible to put the point across to the member so that he can understand it, but the point is that anyone can make allegations about anything. The point is that in order for anything to happen with those allegations, there has to be evidence that in the view of the police they are deemed to be strong enough for them to proceed with charges, and in order for that to happen, people have to be prepared to come forward and give some information.

The problem, as I understand it, is that never, up until February of this year, was there any indication by any individual that in fact anything had happened, and until that happens, it is not possible for any charges to be laid or for the police to even investigate whether there is even the basis for laying of charges. I think that's the long and the short of it. I think that everything has been done in the way that I understand it needs to be done, and again, I think that we are quite frankly on the verge of treading on ground that we should not be treading, given that there are charges that have been laid in one particular instance.

**Mr Jackson:** Let me make it as simple as possible for you, Minister. Letters were sent to Zanana Akande as the minister. They were sent to Marion Boyd as the minister. They were sent to you as the minister. They were sent to the Premier as the Premier. They were sent to Charles Pascal as the deputy minister. They were sent to Margaret Gallow as the assistant deputy minister; to the supervisor of the facility in question, Ms Renwick.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Charges have been laid.

**Mr Jackson:** The charges, the Premier says—I'm surprised with his background in legal understanding he would come out with a phrase like that when those victims have documented that when they went to their supervisors with the facts they were thwarted. They were thwarted. There's a coverup here, and the minister knows about it, and you cannot hide behind one rapist going before the courts today.

**The Speaker:** Could the member—

**Mr Jackson:** The issue today—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member has strayed over

the line. The member should know full well not to be discussing any matter which is before the courts where there are criminal charges. I will allow the member to place a supplementary, provided that he is sensitive to the very important line that is drawn with respect to these matters, and I ask him to place his question quickly.

**Mr Jackson:** Minister, you have acknowledged that you have received two letters documenting this case. Marion Boyd and the letter I just sent to the Premier documents that she's asked for a report about the coverup of the accusations. Did you ever see a report which Marion Boyd, by her own pen and signature, confirms exists? Have you ever seen that report, and don't tell us about your operations review, because that's a separate issue.

**The Speaker:** The question's been placed.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I think I have given the member the information which pertains to my responsibilities in dealing with this matter. Quite frankly, I think my continuing to simply repeat the answers I've given will not satisfy the member, and my going beyond that, I think, would endanger the criminal processes now under way.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, also responsible for casinos in this province. My question is very simple and straightforward: Are you concerned about the possibility that money laundering could be a potential problem in the operation of the Windsor casino project?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** From the very first, as I've said before to my critic in the opposition, we have involved the police, all aspects of the police community, in the formation of the regulatory and enforcement components of the casino. They've been put in charge of the responsibilities for security and policing and I have full confidence that the OPP, in designing security, will leave no stone unturned in terms of making sure that the security of the place is the best in the world.

**Mr Eves:** Mr Alfieri, the ADM of the casino project team, has said: "There is a need for rigorous regulatory enforcement and full investigation of all companies and individuals involved in the casino. It is important to remain extremely vigilant to ensure that no form of crime, organized or otherwise, becomes involved in any way with our casino."

It has recently been reported that the American Internal Revenue Service has found 11,829 instances where 10 Atlantic City casinos have failed to file proper IRS cash reporting forms. Of those 10 casinos, five of those owners are currently on your short list, in the running, to build the Windsor casino project. Have you

ceased negotiations with those five owners?

**Hon Ms Churley:** The process for the choosing of the final operator for the casino is an aboveboard process. People could respond to the request for proposals. The casino project team working with the police, as I've already said, will be doing very thorough background checks on all of the proponents. That's been said before. I'll say it again, and that's been made very clear.

**Mr Eves:** I take it from that, after all that gobbledegook, the answer was: No, we haven't ceased negotiations.

Minister, you have said in this Legislature, and I quote you, "If the regulatory and enforcement aspects are taken care of up front, in fact a casino can be crime-free."

How can you honestly tell me or anybody in the province that you're dealing with the situation up front when you continue to negotiate with five major casino proponents who violated IRS money-laundering filing laws? How can you tell me that?

**Hon Ms Churley:** In fact, that's not what I said, and I personally am not negotiating with anybody. The project team along with the police and other enforcement officers are doing background checks, will continue to do so, and the basis—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Churley:** In conclusion, the ongoing background check, as I understand it, is still going on. The short list has not been produced to date, and further information will be forthcoming as the process continues. The short list has not been completed to date.

1430

#### REPORT ON VICTIMS OF ABUSE

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Attorney General. Minister, earlier this week the government's chief prosecutor, Michael Code, was in the Court of Appeal and successfully blocked the release of the 1976 report into sexual abuse at Grandview school. You are well aware that we have now had two rulings on this same issue, one from the Ontario Information and Privacy Commissioner and the second from the lower court. In both cases, they ruled that the Grandview report could indeed be released, and yet your government is continuing its campaign to suppress the report.

I ask you today, Minister, how much time, staff time, money, are you prepared to spend to suppress this report? One court has already ruled against you. How much further are you prepared to go in order to keep this report from being released?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I have said in this House before that we are prepared to continue to oppose the release of this report because in our belief it would endanger the criminal investigation and prosecu-

tion of the cases in Grandview, and it is extremely important to us as a government that we be seen to be taking very vigorous action against institutional abuse.

**Mrs McLeod:** It is because of the minister's answer, which I must say has been consistent as we have consistently raised this issue, that we continue to have to raise it, because we simply can't understand the government's position, let alone the time and the money it is spending on suppressing the release of this report.

Quite clearly, the minister says it's because it would jeopardize the police investigation. The freedom of information commissioner said that the release of the report would not jeopardize the investigation. His decision has now been confirmed by a court ruling, and yet the minister continues to say they can't release the report because it would jeopardize the investigation.

Minister, there are victims of abuse who are looking to you to help them put this matter to rest, and we simply don't understand why you are continuing this campaign. I wonder what you have to say to the victims of Grandview school about the time and the money that you're spending to suppress a report that both the freedom of information commissioner and the courts have said can be released. I wonder how many other legitimate investigations are being delayed because of the sheer amount of staff time that's being directed towards this issue.

I just ask you: Why is the suppression of this report so important to you and your government?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** It is so important to this government because we believe it might jeopardize the successful criminal investigation and prosecution of those who have been accused by the victims of Grandview. Basically, if we jeopardize our own investigation and our own prosecution, they will not have their day in court, they will not feel vindicated in terms of the actions they have taken and they will not feel that justice has been done. We insist that justice be done and we are concerned that justice will not be done if this investigation and prosecution is jeopardized.

#### HEALTH CARDS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Time and time again I have stood in this Legislature and informed both taxpayers and the government about the widespread fraud that is occurring in Ontario's health card system. Each time, your government has dismissed my concerns and downplayed the extent of fraud. Well, I have another example of fraud.

A doctor diagnosed a woman as needing a hysterectomy and he performed it. Later it came to his attention that a hysterectomy had already been billed against the very same health card number. In other words, two hysterectomies were billed against one card, which means that this card was used in a fraudulent manner.



Minister, can you confirm in fact that there are 280 cases where two hysterectomies have been billed against one health card?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** No, I can't, but I would certainly hope that if the member has some information that can support what he is suggesting, he would furnish it as quickly as possible to OHIP, to the registration division, so that it can be investigated.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** My figures are correct in that they've been verified by bureaucrats in your registration program branch. I continue to raise this issue and cite examples of fraud, and you persist in dragging your feet while money is stolen from the taxpayers of Ontario. You seem incapable of determining who is cheating the health card system.

Last October, I made a number of suggestions to clean up the health card mess created by the Liberals and continued by your government, yet I've just provided you with an example of where your government has made 280 mistakes, and there's no telling just how many more examples of fraud are occurring.

Minister, will you today finally accept my recommendations to improve the health card verification system to ensure that double billings are stopped and taxpayers' dollars are saved?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** As I have explained to the member in the past, we have established a registration program branch to do precisely what he is suggesting, to make sure that only those people eligible for insurance under OHIP in fact are eligible.

I say to the member again that he has made an allegation with respect to misuse of a health card. That is very serious and that concerns me just as much as I'm sure it concerns him, but I need to have the information, the evidence that he has, and I can assure him that it will be investigated and if, in fact, fraud is identified, it will be referred to the OPP for action.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I've stopped the clock and we will run it again in a moment or two. I thought, based on what had transpired earlier in this chamber, it would be appropriate to remind the House of our practice with respect to sub judice.

First of all, it's extremely difficult for the Chair to know precisely what matters are before the court where there are criminal charges involved. I refer members to Beauchesne, sections 505 and 509.

In 505: "Members are expected to refrain from discussing matters that are before the courts or tribunals which are courts of record. The purpose of this sub judice convention is to protect the parties in a case awaiting or undergoing trial and persons who stand to be affected by the outcome of a judicial inquiry. It is a voluntary restraint imposed by the House upon itself in the interest of justice and fair play."

And 509: "The special committee on the rights and immunities of members recommends that the responsibility of the Speaker during the question period should be minimal as regards the sub judice convention, and that the responsibility should principally rest upon the member who asked the question and the minister to whom it is addressed. However, the Speaker should remain the final arbiter in the matter but should exercise discretion only in exceptional cases. In doubtful cases the Speaker should rule in favour of debate and against the convention."

In summary, it is incumbent upon members to be quite vigilant not to abuse the special privilege which members enjoy with respect to freedom of speech. It is also incumbent upon ministers not to reply to questions which they believe are truly sub judice.

Start the clock, please, and I recognize the member for Huron.

#### LAND LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** My question today is to the Minister of Housing. Last month, the member for Simcoe Centre introduced a private member's bill, Bill 21, which would provide protection for over 18,000 households who live in mobile home parks and land lease communities.

The bill would give greater security to tenure for these residents by bringing them under the Rental Housing Protection Act. It would also prohibit the unfair restriction placed on the resale of these homes in mobile parks by some landlords. On this point alone, I can support this private member's bill.

We have a lot of good landlords out there who use a lot of common sense with the tenants, but unfortunately there have been some who do not, and I've seen that at first hand in my office. It really frustrates me that in this day and age, people can do that to one another. In fact, I asked many questions for these people and it came back that they were without protection. This bill, I believe, does give them that kind of protection, so I support it.

My question to the Minister of Housing: Do you support this bill?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Thanks for the question to the member for Huron. The bill is a very interesting bill. What it does is that it moves forward protection which currently exists for people who live in land lease communities, which we often know as mobile home communities, who are currently protected by the Rent Control Act and by the Landlord and Tenant Act, but frequently don't know that.

Further, it would propose that they have coverage under the Rental Housing Protection Act, which would govern whether the mobile home park can be changed in its nature and whether they have to move out the

homes that they own on leased land. We consider this a step forward and will follow the bill with interest.

**Mr Klopp:** I'm glad you want to follow the bill, but it did receive second reading on June 9 and I would like to know what the minister plans to do with this Bill 21.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The Ministry of Housing will be providing information and support in the discussion in committee during the summer, and I'm very hopeful that the bill will be in shape, that it will be able to move right forward and be passed and proclaimed.

1440

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I'm sure he would agree with me that when governments have over a million dollars to spend on polls and hundreds of thousands of dollars to spend on advertising, it would be wise to reduce or eliminate those expenditures and devote the money to matters that the minister, I know, himself would be very dedicated to and would want to address.

I have the instance of Alzheimer patients in the Niagara Peninsula who have been able to take advantage of a respite care program, and the Alzheimer respite workers and I, along with the care givers, the people who live with Alzheimer patients themselves, met last Friday morning to discuss this matter. If you feel it's in the parameters of the Minister of Health, I will certainly accept that. What they require is approximately \$25,000, which isn't one of those \$2-million or \$3-million requests, to keep the program going, because there are more patients but there's going to be the same amount of money.

Could I ask whatever minister wishes to respond to this, because one of the two will I know, whether it would be possible to address this very genuine need. These people who have to deal with Alzheimer patients are at their wits' end, and the respite care workers are quite willing to have those same hours they had before with more patients so that they can solve this problem.

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I believe this area falls within the responsibility of the Minister of Health and I would refer the question.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I would be more than happy to look into the details of the situation that the member has described if he would send those to me. It would seem to me that would fall under the long-term care approach, and certainly we are encouraging the district health councils to move as quickly as possible with respect to their planning for long-term care, of which respite care is a very important part, and look to expanding those services. I'd be happy to look into this particular situation.

**Mr Bradley:** A very similar circumstance exists for

a little girl by the name of Sarah McLaughlin. Sarah McLaughlin is deaf, she is blind, she's developmentally delayed and she is possibly mentally handicapped, according to her parents, as well as being microcephalic, I believe is the terminology, which means that her head and brain are smaller than they would be normally.

These people need some special care. They need a special care worker to work with the child. The parents, and other members of the family, are doing their very best to work with the child. They're finding it extremely difficult, and unfortunately, again, the number of hours that might be available from a special care worker, someone who specializes in that and is used to working with children with these problems, are being cut back.

Could the minister, as well, comment on that and indicate whether there might be an opportunity in the future to be able to continue this program with perhaps even more hours so that this child can have some semblance of a quality of life?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Ruth.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I'm sorry I can't comment on the specific case, but again, if the member would send me the details, I'd be happy to look into it. I don't pretend to try to say that we are able to meet all the needs that exist, but the two instances that he mentions are certainly programs that we are anxious to expand in the future, and I'd be happy to look into the details.

Thank you, ah, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** My profound apologies to the honourable Minister of Health. I think there are too many hours in our days.

#### SERVICES FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Last November, I asked his predecessor about the desperate situation facing young people with intellectual disabilities when they turn 21 and can no longer attend school. I also asked this question last June, one whole year ago.

This month, hundreds more intellectually disabled students have to leave school. For most of them, no vocational or day programs are available. Community Living Mississauga, for example, closed its waiting list in 1990. There were 100 people on the list, and since then only a couple have been placed in long-term employment. Minister, what do you suggest to these disabled young people and their families, who desperately need respite from caring for their children?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** The issue the member is raising is clearly an important one. I don't have a detailed answer I can give her in terms of what specifically can be done to deal with the specific issue she's raised, but certainly there are a number of things that we are trying to do.

The special services at home I think is one way in



which we try to provide that assistance and help for parents and young children with particular disabilities that allows them to stay as much as possible at home and still continue to give some support to parents. I know that through the various associations for community living there are a number of particular ways in which they are looking at trying to address these kinds of problems.

We know, as we are trying to deal with the fiscal situation we are engaged in, that these are the kinds of problems that come to the fore, as they should. I know that in the discussions we continue to have with, in this case, the associations for community living, this continues to be an issue that, obviously, they justifiably raise with us and we with them in terms of what we can do to continue to try to improve the service despite the fiscal problems we have.

**Mrs Marland:** You know, Minister, it's simply a matter of priorities. It's simply a matter of prioritizing in terms of human need. We had more than 4,000 people on the front lawn at Queen's Park last November demonstrating and asking you not to make cuts. If there's enough money in your budget to give unions grants to write union songs, there's enough money to look after these people.

Last month, in a press release about alternatives to sheltered workshops, the minister said: "Defining community-based alternatives is essential for the dignity and wellbeing of people with disabilities. It is important that these alternatives be available before the current system is scaled down."

You have already done that; you have done just that. A year ago, you cut \$1.5 million from sheltered workshops. Last month, you established a working group to provide recommendations on alternatives to workshops. These alternatives still do not exist, but you're already closing the workshops. This policy is a disaster. Intellectually disabled adults have no opportunity to learn important skills or be with people, while their families face the exhausting task of caring full-time for a person with a complex disability.

Minister, I ask you one more time, when will you ensure that there are adequate vocational programs for intellectually disabled adults and sufficient respite support for their families? You just suggested that there are respite programs through the community living associations in the community. That proves you don't know what's going on. Those programs also have been cut.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** The member put a number of different pieces of information together in her question, and I want to address as many of those as I can. She forgot to mention, when she talked about priorities, that in the announcement I made which she referred to, I also announced that we would not be continuing, would not be carrying forward with the \$1.5 million in cuts

that was going to be implemented for the sheltered workshops for this fiscal year.

I think that's an important indication of our interest in supporting the work that goes on through the sheltered workshops, while at the same time being very clear that we want to continue to look for the alternatives that are there in terms of supported employment and a variety of other things that are out there and that are being used and are working. That is very much the approach we want to take. The working group she referred to I hope will give us some clear answers about some other things that we can do beyond what we have been doing.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is an important area of work that we need to do. I think we're on the way to doing some things. Yes, we understand that the fiscal situation is causing problems out there, but I think we're also all interested in trying to do as much as we can to improve the situation, which is why, as I indicated, we did not proceed with the \$1.5 million in cuts to the sheltered workshops in this fiscal year.

1450

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** My question is to the Attorney General, and I'll try to do it in one, without a supplementary, if you'll allow me.

We've seen today a question by one of the honourable members in the opposition with regard to a matter that is before the judiciary and with regard to an investigation by the police. We, as members of the assembly, often are contacted by our constituents in order to take a look at issues which we are sometimes not able to because of conflict-of-interest guidelines.

I want to raise a case in point. I have a local constituent who operates an establishment, a hotel, within my particular community, in the city of Timmins. Basically, some months ago one of the waitresses who worked there was charged for serving liquor to a minor. Consequent to that the person was charged, and from that ensued a court case, in which the judge found the person not guilty and the charges were dropped.

You would think that at that point, because the thing is outside the judiciary, the member would have the opportunity to be able to look into the matter on behalf of the constituent. What ended up happening was that the LLBO consequently suspended the licence of the establishment for some 10 days, obviously financial consequences not to the owner but to the people who work there and the people who frequent that particular establishment.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Is this a speech, a member's private statement? Apparently he must have slept through those; he missed it. Is this a question? It sounds like a statement to me.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** To the member for Parry Sound, I'm watching the clock very closely. I would ask the member to place his question.

**Mr Bisson:** What happened in this particular case is that the place had its licence suspended for some 10 days and I was unable to intervene on behalf of the constituent. What I want to ask the minister is this: When there is a matter that's gone outside of the judiciary; why are we in a position that we're not able to intervene on the part of the constituent, and why is it that a minister is not able to respond to the particular queries of a member?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** An extremely important principle of our justice system, whether it's before the courts or before licensing bureaus or tribunals, is that there be no political interference with the investigation or the consideration of evidence by those particular bodies from those of us who are elected officials, at whatever level.

It's extremely important that when we set up procedures to ensure that due process is followed, no one, as a politician, is able to interfere in any way. An interference can constitute a discussion of evidence, a discussion of possibilities in such cases. Certainly, it's important for us to understand that the findings of a judge or anyone acting as a judge in a tribunal ought not to be subject to criticism by elected people, because that could infer political interference. So it's extraordinarily important that we, as elected members, maintain the integrity of the system.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It has to do with the social contract legislation and, in that respect, the mandated targets municipalities must reach.

I am told that the municipal targets have been arrived at by adding the total amount of compensation paid by the municipalities and taking 5% of that total as the social contract target. Minister, the problem is that you have added all compensation paid by the municipalities. That will include benefits, overtime, part-time, casual, and also salaries of employees under \$30,000.

My question to the minister is, how do you explain the fact that you have asked municipalities across this province to meet a financial target which includes dollars that you have exempted?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** That's an issue that was brought to my attention by a number of the municipalities, the latest being Hazel McCallion, whom I'm about to—

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** Your pal.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Yes, I'm sure she likes me more than she likes Mr Mahoney. I think that issue was settled last time.

I will be returning a call to Mayor McCallion momentarily. She's expecting me to call her, and I'll try and confirm that one way or the other. It is a matter we brought to the attention of the sector team, and it's looking at that. If there's another way of calculating it, they'll be looking at that, but we have not had any specific proposals from any municipality as to how to do it differently.

**Mr Offer:** The minister just hasn't answered the question. You have absolutely acknowledged that the information I have received, which was from the city of Mississauga, is correct, that you have set targets which include dollars that you have exempted. I know there is a letter that has been sent to you, that is on your desk, which outlines this problem. I am also aware that the mayor of the city of Mississauga has requested that you to call her back in order to deal with this issue. You have, firstly, not answered the letter and, secondly, you have not returned any telephone call.

The actions taken by the city of Mississauga and indeed by the mayor of Mississauga are representative of municipalities across the province. At this point in time, it is not enough for you to acknowledge that indeed the municipalities are correct.

I would ask you, what are you going to say to the municipalities when they are asking how you expect them to reach targets which are based on dollars that you have exempted? I would expect that if you have acknowledged that there is this problem, you indeed have a solution to that problem. You have the opportunity and indeed the responsibility to tell members in this Legislature and, through that, municipalities across this province how it is that they are going to be able to meet your mandated targets.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I missed something. Whose phone call did the honourable member say I didn't return? Then maybe I can answer the rest of the question, because I can tell you that I return everyone's phone call. In the case of Mississauga, my parliamentary assistant has met with Mississauga and the mayor some three times during the last few weeks, as has my staff. I received notice this morning that Mrs McCallion wanted to speak to me and in fact I'm returning her call after question period.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** They want to talk to you, Ed, because they like you better.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The member for Oriole with her noisy interjections won't let me answer the question of her colleague.

**Mrs Caplan:** You're not answering anyway, Ed.

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the minister direct his response to the Chair, please.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I'd be happy to answer the question if the member for Oriole would be quiet enough to allow me to have my voice carry over her head to a



member who actually is allowed by his caucus to ask questions in this House.

In the case of Mississauga, in fact he's correct. There are some 341 employees who are under the \$30,000 out of 2,600 employees. But if you look at all the other sectors, they're being treated in an identical manner and they face the identical situation. So municipalities are not being treated differently from any other sector.

Again, I say to him, as a member of a caucus that has no concrete proposals to give on this matter, what does he suggest we use? Let's hear what his views are. We'll consider any other method of doing it if he can provide some constructive alternative to dealing with it this way.

#### SENATE OF CANADA

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I have a question to the Deputy Premier. About a year ago, this Legislature had a free vote on a resolution which I presented to this Legislature. That resolution was that the Senate of Canada be abolished. In light of the obscene and insensitive increases with regard to what the Senate has voted itself in this recessionary period, would the government of Ontario now take the position of this Legislative Assembly that the Senate of Canada be abolished?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier):** I'm way ahead of the member for Carleton. I just ordered this morning that it be abolished.

**Mr Sterling:** I, unfortunately, believe it is a very serious question.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** It is.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Durham Centre.

1500

**Mr Sterling:** I believe that the Senate of Canada no longer has the confidence of the people of Ontario and that this matter should be considered very seriously at this time. Therefore, my question is not in jest. It is a matter of time. Formal reconstruction of the Senate has failed, and my belief is that senators who are presently occupying the Red Chamber in Ottawa have failed the people of Canada; the most recent exhibition by them of their insensitivity to what the economic strains are on the people of Ontario and Canada was evidenced in their increase of their own pay by \$6,000, while this Legislature has not voted its MPPs one cent of increase over the past two or three years.

I believe that the Senate of Canada should be abolished. Will you, Mr Deputy Premier, put before this Legislature another resolution so that it will then have the sanction of government that the Senate of Canada be abolished, and therefore that resolution will have standing and therefore lead the way that this Red Chamber, this unelected group of officials, this group of people who no longer have relevance to Canada, Ontario, be abolished?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I do have a great deal of sympathy with the comments from the member for Carleton, because I agree with virtually everything he said, and I will undertake to consult with my colleagues—I would not want to make a unilateral declaration in that regard—about the possibility of doing just that.

I would further say, Mr Speaker, that one reason I agree with the member for Carleton is that the recent appointments by the Prime Minister have made the Senate even more irrelevant than it was before.

#### PETITIONS

##### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Mr Speaker, I have a petition, as you probably might be aware, on the status of Bruce A.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"When discussing the future of Bruce A, to consider that the undersigned are in full support of the continued operation of all the units at Bruce A. Furthermore, we support the expenditure of the required money to rehabilitate the Bruce A units for the following reasons:

"In comparison to other forms of generation, nuclear energy is environmentally safe and cost-effective. Rehabilitating Bruce A units is expected to achieve \$2 billion in savings to the corporation over the station's lifetime. This power is needed for the province's future prosperity.

"A partial or complete closure of Bruce A will have severe negative impacts on the affected workers and will seriously undermine the economy of the surrounding communities and the province."

I've attached my signature to this batch of petitions, which form part of a petition which has well over 15,000 signatures on it, and I provide it now for the page to bring to the table.

##### CLOSURE OF FISHERIES RESEARCH UNIT

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a petition. The petition is to the Legislative Assembly, and in particular the Minister of Natural Resources:

"We, the undersigned, request that the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources reconsider its decision to close the Lake Huron fisheries research unit at South Baymouth. The planned relocation to Owen Sound will have a serious impact on the fragile economy of Manitoulin Island. We need the jobs in the north.

"Furthermore, the relocation to Owen Sound will cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in moving expenses and rental of office, work and dock space at Owen Sound. Better facilities currently exist at South Baymouth at little cost to the taxpayer."

This petition contains literally hundreds of signatures

of the people of Manitoulin Island.

#### ACCESSORY APARTMENTS

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a petition signed by a large number of the residents of the great city of Brampton, including the Tuckers and the Harrises, and it goes as follows:

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have released draft legislation for apartments in houses, granny flats, to permit accessory dwelling units as of right in all residential areas and to permit granny flats;

"We, the undersigned, object to the draft legislation for apartments in houses, granny flats, for the following reasons and petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"(1) That the province examine the implications that the proposed legislation may have on the rights of property owners, landlords and tenants with respect to their expectations of zoning authority in the neighbourhoods in which they live;

"(2) That the province not entertain this proposed legislation removing the right of local government to regulate development without adequate public notification and opportunity to review and comment on the draft legislation;

"(3) That the local municipality be granted the authority to regulate and license, or register, accessory apartments;

"(4) That the province in consultation with local and regional authorities examine methods of compensating the municipality for increased costs of servicing new residential growth;

"(5) That right of entry for bylaw enforcement officers to inspect accessory apartments during reasonable hours be incorporated into the legislation;

"(6) That representatives from the Ministry of Housing and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs be requested to conduct a public meeting in Brampton to discuss the draft legislation with my community;

"(7) That the city of Brampton supports granny flats as a form of housing intensification subject to the assurance that the units will be removed at the end of their intended use."

I have affixed my signature thereto.

#### GAMBLING

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling (Macdonald and Macdonald, Patho-

logical Gambling: The Problem, Treatment and Outcome, Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling); and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

This petition has been signed by more than 100 citizens of London, Ontario. I have affixed my name to it.

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** That's a hard act to follow, the good people of London who know enough not to support casinos. I have some petitions here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown," and I might even say proven, "that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime," vis-à-vis the great question from the House leader,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I am glad to affix my signature to this very fine petition.

1510

#### NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** As a northern



member I am very pleased to bring forward this petition.

"Whereas an MRI is an imaging modality superior to the CAT scan, which is particularly useful in diagnosing diseases of the brain, spine and joints;

"Whereas it eliminates the need for other invasive tests and procedures such as myelography, angiography and arthroscopy;

"Whereas patients from the Sudbury area have been having MRI examinations in other centres since 1985 when the first unit was installed in Toronto;

"Whereas the MRI scans are now available in all parts of Ontario except northern Ontario. There are 10 units approved in the province;

"Whereas an MRI is needed to maintain the team of neurosurgeons that have been recruited for the Sudbury area;

"Whereas the approval of a unit for Sudbury is long overdue;

"Whereas Sudbury has been designated the north-eastern centre of health,

"We, the undersigned, support the neurosurgeons at the Sudbury General Hospital in their request for a magnetic resonance imaging machine."

I hereto affix my signature.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I just wish to file notice, by way of introducing this petition from Ripley, Ontario, and area, that the people there are against the operation of large-scale gambling activities in the province, because they attract crime. They say, therefore:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

It's signed by Mary MacDonald and Irma MacDonald of Ripley, along with several others, the neighbours and good folk of Ripley and area. I've affixed my name.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assem-

bly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

It's signed by 87 residents of the province of Ontario and I affix my signature.

#### SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a petition from a group called WRAP, which is Waterdown Residents Against Pollution. It's a petition to the Legislature of Ontario.

"The Waterdown Residents Against Pollution are concerned with the application by Barmin Inc of the town of Flamborough for a certificate of approval for a waste disposal processing site on their entire 32-acre site.

"This application is for 10 waste classes, including hazardous by definition, corrosive, leachate, toxic and registerable non-hazardous.

"The Waterdown Residents Against Pollution are requesting that the Minister of the Environment exercise his right to designate this major business undertaking under the Environmental Assessment Act and call a hearing that socioeconomic conditions that will influence the life of this residential community be examined; that studies and monitoring be undertaken to ensure that no health risks to residents exist; and that the suitability of this proposal in a growing residential location and other options be explored, in addition to the technical issues, before the certification of this site is considered."

It's signed by approximately 800 residents of the town of Flamborough.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a petition signed by about 100 of the good residents of my riding, including the Fyshes, the Lees and the Robertsons. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases;"—they should change that; they've already gotten that hit—"and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law by this government will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

I've affixed my signature thereto and I concur with their concerns.

#### SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a petition of over 1,061 names opposing the closing of

workshops for the handicapped to be presented in the open forum of this parliamentary session.

Mr Speaker, it isn't in the proper format, but I would like you and the minister to be aware that in regard to the workshops for the handicapped there is tremendous support across the province of Ontario and that all of these people in London, Ontario, are opposed to the closing of the workshops for the handicapped.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I have a petition here signed by approximately 110 people, not in my riding; they're from Windsor, Essex, Kingsville and those areas. I will not read all the "whereases," just to save repetition here. It says:

"To the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I would like to file another petition with the Legislative Assembly. Actually, I think it's part of a much larger petition that has gone round the province, but the good folks of Allenford and Hepworth have joined together to sign a petition that has requested that the Legislative Assembly force the government to cease all moves to establishing gambling places.

The Warmingtons from rural route 3, Allenford, have signed this, Elgin and Marg Rourke, Vera Thompson and Verna Matthews, among others, and I would just like to indicate that I have added my signature to the petition.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. It's signed by 30 residents of Ontario who petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have a petition here signed by hundreds of working women in my riding and throughout the Durham region, women such as Kathy Lenahan, Vi Pilkey, Brenda Harford, Winnie McKinley, and they are concerned about the future of their children because of the NAFTA deal.

"Whereas we feel that the Canada-US free trade deal does immeasurable damage to the economy of the province of Ontario, causing a loss of more than 45,000 jobs in Ontario alone; and

"Whereas we feel the proposed North American free trade agreement will have an even more devastating effect in Ontario, resulting in a loss not only of jobs but

also in a reduction in our environmental standards, our labour standards, our workers' rights and our overall quality of life;

"We petition the Legislature of Ontario in Toronto to fight this trade deal with whatever means possible; and

"We petition the House of Commons in Ottawa to stop this deal now."

I affixed my name thereto.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Wayne Lessard (Windsor-Walkerville):** I have a petition from residents in the Windsor and Essex county area requesting the withdrawal of Bill 164.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Prior to orders of day, I invite all members to welcome to our midst this afternoon a former member for Halton North, Mr Walt Elliot, who's seated in the members' gallery west. Welcome.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could you invite Mr Elliot to take a seat here on the floor? Is that within your power, I would ask?

**The Speaker:** I'm sorry to disappoint you, but no, it is not within my power.

**Mr Elston:** Walter, you'll have to run again. Mr Elliot will probably have to run again, then, to win a seat here.

**The Speaker:** There are many in the province who wish to seek public office.

1520

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

#### REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF DURHAM AMENDMENT ACT (NEWCASTLE-CLARINGTON), 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE DE DURHAM (NEWCASTLE-CLARINGTON)

Consideration of Bill 6, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of Durham Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur la municipalité régionale de Durham.

**The Chair (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Are there any questions, comments or amendments and, if so, to which sections of the bill?

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I'd like to say a few words about section 1 of this bill. It's a very important day in my riding. This bill sees the name change from the town of Newcastle to the municipality of Clarington. It's been long awaited by my constituents and it's been long awaited by the mayor and the council of the town of Newcastle, and I'd just like to thank everyone in this House for their cooperation in making this possible in time for the celebrations that the township has planned for July 1.



**The Chair:** Are there any further questions or comments on section 1? Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Any further questions or comments on any sections of the act? Shall sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 carry? Carried.

Shall the bill be reported? Agreed.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move the committee rise and report.

**The Chair:** Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? Carried.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again. Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to deal with third reading on Bill 6.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

506548 ONTARIO LIMITED ACT, 1993

In motion by Mr Eves, on behalf of Mr Harnick, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr1, An Act to revive 506548 Ontario Limited.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With respect to private bills, we are prepared to consent to doing both second and third reading on each of the matters, rather than having any question raised about whether or not we wish to deal with the two orders together.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

WOMEN'S COUNSELLING  
REFERRAL CENTRE ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Huget, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr2, An Act to revive the Women's Counselling Referral Centre.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF  
VETERINARY TECHNICIANS ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Lessard, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Ontario Association of Veterinary Technicians.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CITY OF LONDON ACT (COVENT  
GARDEN MARKET CORPORATION), 1993

On motion by Mr Huget, on behalf of Mr Winninger, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of London and Covent Garden Building Incorporated.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

KOREAN CANADIAN CULTURAL  
ASSOCIATION ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr David Johnson, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Korean Canadian Cultural Association.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CHUA DI-DA (AMIDATEMPLE)  
OF TORONTO ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Elston, on behalf of Mr Ruprecht, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Chua Di-Da (Amida-temple) of Toronto.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CITY OF LONDON ACT  
(VITAL SERVICES), 1993

On motion by Mrs Mathysen, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the City of London.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

KITCHENER-WATERLOO FOUNDATION ACT, 1993

On motion by Mrs Witmer, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting The Kitchener and Waterloo Community Foundation.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

1530

AGA MING PROPERTY OWNERS  
ASSOCIATION ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Eves, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr17, An Act to revive Aga Ming Property Owners Association.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CITY OF GLOUCESTER ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Elston, on behalf of Mr Morin, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr 18, An Act respecting the City of Gloucester.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

TOWN OF GRAVENHURST ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Waters, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Town of Gravenhurst.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

JOHN G. TODD AGENCIES LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Cooper, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive John G. Todd Agencies Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CAMBRIDGE-GUELPH RAILWAY COMPANY  
LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Eves, on behalf of Mr Arnott, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting Cambridge-Guelph Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

GEORGIAN-SIMCOE RAILWAY  
COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Jim Wilson, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Georgian-Simcoe Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

PICTON-TRENTON RAILWAY  
COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Paul Johnson, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting Picton-Trenton Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

STRATFORD, HURON AND BRUCE  
RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Elston, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Stratford, Huron and Bruce Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

WATERLOO-ST JACOBS RAILWAY  
COMPANY LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mrs Witmer, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting Waterloo-St Jacobs Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

WAUBAUSHENE RAILWAY COMPANY  
LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Waters, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting Waubausheene Railway Company Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

1540

ROSALIND BLAUER CENTRE  
FOR CHILD CARE ACT, 1993

On motion by Ms Haeck, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr34, An Act to revive Rosalind Blauer Centre for Child Care.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CANINDO DEVELOPMENT LIMITED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Huget, on behalf of Mr Marchese, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr36, An Act to revive Canindo Development Limited.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

P.O.I.N.T. INCORPORATED ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Mahoney, on behalf of Ms Poole, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr37, An Act to revive P.O.I.N.T. Incorporated.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

TOWNSHIP OF ATIKOKAN ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Huget, on behalf of Mr Wood, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the Township of Atikokan.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Mahoney, on behalf of Mr Chiarelli, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr69, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CITY OF NORTH YORK ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Perruzza, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr74, An Act respecting the City of North York.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Mahoney, on behalf of Mr Sorbara, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr77, An Act respecting the Town of Richmond Hill.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

MARANATHA CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH  
OF WOODBRIDGE ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Mahoney, on behalf of Mr Sorbara, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr84, An Act to revive Maranatha Christian Reformed Church of Woodbridge.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

OPTIMIST CLUB  
OF KITCHENER-WATERLOO ACT, 1993

On motion by Mrs Witmer, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr85, An Act to revive The Optimist Club of Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.



TOWNSHIP OF ALDBOROUGH  
AND VILLAGE OF RODNEY ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr North, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr87, An Act respecting the Township of Aldborough and the Village of Rodney.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CRUICKSHANK ELDERLY PERSONS  
CENTRE ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Huget, on behalf of Mrs MacKinnon, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr88, An Act respecting the Cruickshank Elderly Persons Centre.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

*Report continues in volume B.*





SECOND AND THIRD READINGS [CONTINUED]		Canindo Development Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr36	Optimist Club of Kitchener-Waterloo Act, 1993, Bill Pr85
Georgian-Simcoe Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr27		Mr Huget . . . . . 1964	Mrs Witmer . . . . . 1964
Mr Jim Wilson . . . . . 1964		P.O.I.N.T. Incorporated Act, 1993, Bill Pr37	Township of Aldborough and Village of Rodney Act, 1993, Bill Pr87
Picton-Trenton Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr29		Mr Mahoney . . . . . 1964	Mr North . . . . . 1965
Mr Paul Johnson . . . . . 1964		Township of Atikokan Act, 1993, Bill Pr38	Cruikshank Elderly Persons Centre Act, 1993, Bill Pr88
Stratford, Huron and Bruce Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr30		Mr Huget . . . . . 1964	Mr Huget . . . . . 1965
Mr Elston . . . . . 1964		City of Ottawa Act, 1993, Bill Pr69	
Waterloo-St Jacobs Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr31		Mr Mahoney . . . . . 1964	
Mrs Witmer . . . . . 1964		City of North York Act, 1993, Bill Pr74	
Waubashene Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr32		Mr Perruzza . . . . . 1964	
Mr Waters . . . . . 1964		Town of Richmond Hill Act, 1993, Bill Pr77	
Rosalind Blauer Centre for Child Care Act, 1993, Bill Pr43		Mr Mahoney . . . . . 1964	
Ms Haeck . . . . . 1964		Maranatha Christian Reformed Church of Woodbridge Act, 1993, Bill Pr84	
		Mr Mahoney . . . . . 1964	

OTHER BUSINESS

<b>Birthdays</b>	
Mr Mills . . . . .	1947
Mr Villeneuve . . . . .	1947
<b>Legislative pages</b>	
Mrs Caplan . . . . .	1947
The Speaker . . . . .	1947
<b>Visitor</b>	
The Speaker . . . . .	1949, 1962
Mr Elston . . . . .	1962
<b>Parliamentary practice</b>	
The Speaker . . . . .	1955

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 24 juin 1993

DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES  
ET RÉPONSES

<b>Fête de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste</b>	
M. Pouliot . . . . .	1947
M. Grandmaître . . . . .	1948
M. Villeneuve . . . . .	1949

# CONTENTS

Thursday 24 June 1993

## PRIVATE MEMBERS'

### PUBLIC BUSINESS

#### Human Rights Code Amendment Act (Sexual Orientation), 1993, Bill 45

Mr Murphy	1927, 1935
Mr Cousens	1928
Mr Winninger	1931
Mr Ramsay	1932
Mr Marchese	1933
Mr Curling	1933
Ms Carter	1934
Mrs Caplan	1934

#### Municipal Amendment Act (Tax Exemptions), 1993, Bill 46

Mr Jordan	1936, 1943
Ms Haeck	1937
Mr Eddy	1938
Mr Sterling	1938
Mr White	1940
Mrs Caplan	1942

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### Zena and Leon Kossar

Mr Ruprecht	1945
-------------	------

#### Conservation authorities

Mr Jordan	1945
-----------	------

#### Berean Community Housing

Mr Huget	1945
----------	------

#### Math Trek

Mr Daigeler	1945
-------------	------

#### Orangeville Kinsmen

Mr Tilson	1946
-----------	------

#### St Thomas of Villanova secondary school

Mr Dadamo	1946
-----------	------

#### Bicycling safety

Mrs Caplan	1946
------------	------

#### Continuing education awards

Mrs Cunningham	1946
----------------	------

#### Grimsby Happening-in-the-Park

Mr Hansen	1947
-----------	------

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

### AND RESPONSES

#### Highway construction

Mr Daigeler	1948
-------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Transfer payments to municipalities

Mrs McLeod	1949
Mr Rae	1949

#### Hydro rates

Mrs McLeod	1951
Mr Wildman	1951

#### York Detention Centre

Mr Jackson	1952
Mr Silipo	1952

#### Gambling

Mr Eves	1953
Ms Churley	1953

#### Report on victims of abuse

Mrs McLeod	1954
Mrs Boyd	1954

#### Health cards

Mr Jim Wilson	1954
Mrs Grier	1955

#### Land lease communities

Mr Klopp	1955
Ms Gigantes	1955

#### Long-term care

Mr Bradley	1956
Mrs Grier	1956

#### Services for the developmentally disabled

Mrs Marland	1956
Mr Silipo	1956

#### Conflict of interest

Mr Bisson	1957
Mrs Boyd	1958

#### Social contract

Mr Offer	1958
Mr Philip	1958

#### Senate of Canada

Mr Sterling	1959
Mr Laughren	1959

## PETITIONS

#### Bruce generating station

Mr Elston	1959
-----------	------

#### Closure of fisheries research unit

Mr Brown	1959
----------	------

#### Accessory apartments

Mr Callahan	1960
-------------	------

#### Gambling

Mrs Cunningham	1960
Mr Drainville	1960
Mr Elston	1961, 1962

#### Northern health services

Ms Murdock	1961
------------	------

#### Automobile insurance

Mr David Johnson	1961
Mr Callahan	1961
Mr Hayes	1962
Ms Carter	1962
Mr Lessard	1962

#### Sheltered workshops

Mr Abel	1961
Mrs Cunningham	1962

#### International trade

Mr White	1962
----------	------

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

#### Regional Municipality of Durham Amendment Act (Newcastle-Clarington), 1993, Bill 6,

third reading

Mr Mills	1962
Mr Charlton	1963

## SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

#### 506548 Ontario Limited Act, 1993

Mr Eves	1963
---------	------

#### Women's Counselling Referral Centre Act, 1993, Bill Pr2

Mr Huget	1963
----------	------

#### Ontario Association of Veterinary Technicians Act, 1993, Bill Pr3

Mr Lessard	1963
------------	------

#### City of London Act (Covent Garden Market Corporation Act, 1993, Bill Pr4

Mr Huget	1963
----------	------

#### Korean Canadian Cultural Association Act, 1993, Bill Pr5

Mr David Johnson	1963
------------------	------

#### Chua Di-Da (Amidatemple) of Toronto Act, 1993, Bill Pr11

Mr Elston	1963
-----------	------

#### City of London Act (Vital Services), 1993, Bill Pr13

Mrs Mathysen	1963
--------------	------

#### Kitchener-Waterloo Foundation Act, 1993, Bill Pr14

Mrs Witmer	1963
------------	------

#### Aga Ming Property Owners Association Act, 1993, Bill Pr17

Mr Eves	1963
---------	------

#### City of Gloucester Act, 1993, Bill Pr17

Mr Elston	1963
-----------	------

#### Town of Gravenhurst Act, 1993, Bill Pr19

Mr Waters	1964
-----------	------

#### John G. Todd Agencies Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr21

Mr Cooper	1964
-----------	------

#### Cambridge-Guelph Railway Company Limited Act, 1993, Bill Pr26

Mr Eves	1964
---------	------

*Continued overleaf*



C251  
X1  
-053

C251  
X1  
-053

No. 38B



N° 38B

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 24 June 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Jeudi 24 juin 1993



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Thursday 24 June 1993

*Report continued from volume A.*

1550

## INTERIM SUPPLY

Mr Laughren moved government notice of motion number 7:

That the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing July 1, 1993, and ending October 31, 1993, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I am indeed introducing today the motion of interim supply. As members will know, spending authority, other than for payments authorized by a specific statute, is granted by the Legislature to the government by the process known as supply, as governed by the House standing orders and parliamentary tradition. Prior to the passing of the Supply Act, government spending proceeds under a motion of interim supply. When the Legislature is not in session, a special warrant specifying a dollar limit for spending for each ministry is issued by the Lieutenant Governor.

Government spending is currently authorized by a special warrant which is estimated to provide sufficient funds to June 30. To ensure that spending authority continues after June 30, a motion of interim supply needs to be approved by this Legislature. Without a motion, delays in payments will start July 2, affecting suppliers of goods and services, utility companies, contractors for tree-planting, doctors, private medical laboratories, transfer payment agencies and payments to municipalities.

I look forward to hearing the contribution from members on all sides to this debate. It's an important debate. I would like to apologize in advance to the members because I must make an appearance before the standing committee on finance and economic affairs this afternoon, but I'll stay as long as I can here and I look forward to the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Are there any questions or comments on the minister's presentation? If not, is there any further debate?

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I appreciate the opportunity to speak for up to 90 minutes, in this particular case, on interim supply. Supply motions are always interesting in that they allow a very wide debate, one which can take into account all matters which come under the spending of the government of the province of Ontario, and I'm going to ensure that this is rather wide-ranging in terms of the speech that I'll be delivering this afternoon.

I want to indicate first of all that I certainly won't be offended by the Treasurer leaving during this. I recognize that ministers have other responsibilities than sitting in the House, and I appreciate the fact that the minister will be here as long as he possibly can and that he has to appear before a committee. I know that he will want to read the entire Hansard of this and that, once it is produced in terms of Instant Hansard, he'll be taking it back to Chelmsford and back to the city of Sudbury and Warden and all those places nearby where he'll be sure to read each and every one of the remarks.

I want initially, because we had the opportunity the other day to pay tribute to a couple of people, to take advantage of this opportunity to do so again.

The passing of Smirle Forsyth, who was a table officer and a person I had a chance to work with for a long time, was indeed sad for all members of the House, those who worked directly with him over the years. The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, Mr Philip, and I sat on the justice committee, and Mr Forsyth had to provide an awful lot of interesting information to us on what opposition members could do and what government members could do in regard to the investigation that took place at that time. It was under a minority government, and a rather exciting time at that time. So I certainly pass along once again, as other members have, my condolences to the family, and certainly we will all miss Smirle.

The second, and I had the opportunity to speak on behalf of our party on this occasion, was in paying tribute to the late Bud Germa, again an MPP from the Sudbury area who worked very hard on behalf of his constituents at the municipal level, the provincial level and the federal level and was certainly a fighter for many of those causes. We think of those people when they do pass on and their names come before the Legislature. There are some fond memories there.

I want to talk about a variety of subjects this afternoon under interim supply and indicate that it's most unfortunate that we find ourselves in the circumstances we do in Ontario today of having a huge debt, an unprecedented deficit and debt accumulating. It's certainly understandable that the government would now want to address this and would have to address it in a pretty substantial way to be effective. I well recall the days of the Davis administration when I was in opposition and there were deficits run then. In fact, Ontario has had only one surplus since 1971 that I can recall, and that was the surplus in the 1989-90 fiscal year. It was a very modest surplus, but for the first time in certainly the recent history of the province of Ontario, the debt was actually paid down.

It was anticipated as well that that circumstance

would continue. In 1990-91 it was predicted on the recommendation and information provided by the treasury ministry people that we could anticipate another surplus on that occasion. We found, of course, as the recession set in and came very quickly, as revenues dropped drastically in the second half of the year and as unpredictable expenditures rose rather substantially, that in fact there would be a deficit. No one knew the exact amount but it was anticipated that it would be \$300 million or \$400 million once the year was on.

Sometimes we in opposition are critical of the Treasurer and others when they make predictions that don't come true. To be fair to everybody who has held that position of Treasurer, it is often a difficult prediction to make because one can't always anticipate what the revenues are going to be or indeed what the unexpected expenditures are going to be. We hope that people are within the ballpark, but it's often difficult to be precise. In fact, in many years when the Liberal Party was in power and the provincial economy was extremely vibrant and prosperous we would from time to time receive good news that even more revenue than had been anticipated would be coming from the federal government because times were good and also the provincial revenues.

Such is not the case now. Very often the revenues are more modest than the government would have hoped for. If you looked right across the country in the fall of 1990, you would see that every government in Canada changed its predictions. We had everybody from British Columbia to Newfoundland and the provinces in between, including the federal government which had anticipated much greater revenue and had anticipated that the expenditures, the ones that you don't expect, would not be rising in any significant way. In fact, every province encountered the problem with the recession and every province and the federal government revised its predictions, just as the present Treasurer had to at the latter part of the year after the previous Treasurer, Mr Nixon, had the information from the treasury officials that we could anticipate a surplus. Mr Laughren, as Treasurer, found, as everybody did across the country at that time, as the recession set in that it wasn't going to be the case.

Many people advocated—and the government took the chance to do something different—that that was the time to trim the expenditures, to delay the programs, perhaps to cancel some programs and perhaps to move more slowly on some projects. The government chose on that occasion, and it was a gamble but I'm sure—I don't know, I can't speak for the government today—that upon reflection they might have done things differently. But it was a gamble on the part of the government to try to stimulate the economy and to try to stop the recession from setting in as deeply as it might have. Those are chances that people have to take.

We in opposition have the opportunity to view now what has happened and to offer constructive and sometimes not-so-constructive criticism. But it was a gamble the government took contrary to what some people had suggested. We now face a different circumstance. Every province has, with British Columbia being a little bit different, but most provinces have had to change the way that they have operated their business in the last couple of years. This government is no different.

I want to talk about the consequences of this in two ways. What I find disturbing and disappointing, and dismaying to a certain extent, is watching how in difficult economic times some people turn on other people, often the people who are vulnerable. People who are reliant, for instance, upon public assistance are the victims of some unfair attacks by those who, while they have had a decline in their incomes or have had some economic difficulties, are not facing the same consequences as some people at the bottom rung of the ladder.

1600

We have seen some examples of people who wish to point fingers at the most vulnerable, in many cases, and say that those people shouldn't be receiving money in these difficult economic times. It doesn't happen so much in good economic times because everything's booming, people are making big profits, and although people are paying taxes, especially a lot of income tax, nevertheless they seem to be existing quite well.

I think we as political representatives have a responsibility, yes, to look at each expenditure carefully, to make any changes in social programs that are going to be beneficial but still provide the basics for people, but not go overboard in aiming our financial guns and our critical guns at those who are the most vulnerable in our society. It's a cheap political trick to do it, but it works, I must say. In the short term, it can garner some significant support.

The same can be said of restraint. I don't think there's anybody in this House, as I said yesterday, who doesn't support restraint. I simply like people out there to know what it means when governments are embarking upon programs of austerity and restraint.

The Treasurer has indicated this himself on a number of occasions, that it's not without pain. When people are demanding that taxes be either cut or at least not raised significantly, or when people are demanding that the expenditures of the government be reduced rather substantially, there are consequences: people who have a 16-year-old who wants to get a licence, who may want to get a job in the summer, and the person who used to conduct the test has retired. As the leader of the third party has suggested, there should be total attrition and a total freeze on any new jobs in the civil service. What happens on that occasion is that person isn't replaced, and now you wait till the middle of August to



have your test.

That's why I think governments have to have some flexibility. I don't think saying simply that there should be a freeze across the board on civil service staffing levels is the answer. I think the government has to have the flexibility to look at where those cuts are going to be. They may choose certain areas that are less likely to cause problems for the general public than other areas—I hope, of course, that is what the government is doing—but to simply suggest that you can freeze all of these positions and not have consequences for people, I think, is unrealistic.

If we went ministry by ministry, program by program, project by project, we would find that when the government constrains its expenditures, that means there's less money that's going to be in circulation; that means the opportunity for governments to stimulate the economy is reduced. The hope is, of course, that the private sector will pick up the slack, that people will have more money in their own hands to spend as consumers and that the economy will bounce back as a result.

One of the other consequences I want to talk about is the area of the environment, having had some responsibility in years gone by for the environment. One of my sources of discouragement today is the fact that the environment is not high on the list of everybody's initiatives. I think it's understandable but lamentable.

If we look at the amount of coverage, for instance, in the popular news media of environmental issues, we find that has diminished considerably over the past few years, because the concentration is on straight economic problems. As a result, I have often talked in this House of the CBC, which was always a leader in terms of dealing with social issues and issues of interest to a rather significant portion of the population.

I was discussing one of my programs with a member of the government side who mentioned that he had listened to Radio Noon on many occasions. Even though he's in government now and, I guess, can take some satisfaction in the fact that there's not as much criticism, he was saying he missed the fact, as I do, that Radio Noon is not a hard-hitting program any more. They're now interested in how you grow flowers, which is nice, or how you fix your appliances or things of that nature. I rather fancied the program when it was hard-hitting. Even though I was the victim, many times, of the interviewers, I still found that it helped, in general, the cause of the environment.

Look at the number of areas where the government can be moving and is not, largely because of the economy and because there's not media interest in the environment. I look at such things as the clean air program, which was announced in 1990. It was hoped that it would progressively be put into effect. It's not something you can do overnight, it's not an easy

program to implement, but we have seen virtually no movement on the clean air program at all, none that I'm aware of.

The government faces two situations: first, a private sector which is not interested in spending money or being dislocated, and second, even a public sector which doesn't want to move too quickly. The hospitals of this province, which have to deal with biomedical waste and have incinerators still have incinerators going in this province, not all of them as clean in terms of their burning process and the emissions they produce as might be possible.

But there is no CBC program, there's no interview, there's no television show with the camera on the incinerator and the questions of people, because they're down interviewing people where a job has been lost, where plants have closed and things of that nature. That environmental problem will continue.

The municipal-industrial strategy for abatement, or what we refer to as the water pollution control—

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the government should keep a quorum in here to listen to this important debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would ask the table, is there a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex D. McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mr Bradley:** In continuing my remarks—

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Downsview, I would ask you to refrain from interjecting.

**Mr Bradley:** As I continue, I've heard something in the chamber that reminds me of something else. I find it ironic to the greatest extent that a New Democrat would ever be bragging about the compliment from Hal Jackman as an individual, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, because in years gone by before he had the esteemed office of Lieutenant Governor, we well recall that his allegiance was to the political party to the right of everybody else. I find that suitably amusing and I hope all New Democrats take note of where they're getting compliments from these days.

On the issue of the environment, I could go into various issues that I think are important and should be dealt with, but again it's the financial restraint. The Minister of Environment and Energy today deals with fewer staff. I can recall that when I was minister, everybody wanted more staff, everybody wanted more equipment, everybody wanted more resources for the Ministry of the Environment.

Economics has dictated that the government must downsize and those who are recommending that down-

sizing, for instance, in the field of the environment, must know that there are consequences of that. There are fewer inspectors who are going to be available, fewer scientists who are going to be available, fewer employees all round and fewer resources available to deal with environmental issues. Just because the heat is off those issues today doesn't mean that they still aren't important, that those problems still aren't significant for our province, but I'm afraid that, at least in the interim, we're not going to see the kind of attention that should be devoted to those.

I may come back to the environment a little later on in my remarks, but something else I want to talk about in my address today deals with the general discussions over the social contract, one of the other consequences. When I started my remarks today, I mentioned that sometimes when we're in difficult economic times, they become mean times, lean and mean times. Everybody realizes there are going to be lean times, but they become mean times.

1610

One of the things I am concerned about is the obvious glee with which many people are attacking people in the public sector, public servants who have endeavoured to deliver services to people in this province over the years. I hear the government gets a lot of these recommendations. In fact, some of the cheering that comes for the government policy now must make some of the members of the government blush a bit. I'm sure they don't relish those compliments. They must cringe a bit when some of the people who are complimenting the government are people who have in the past been critical of everything the NDP has stood for.

What I see out there is quite a division that's developing. We've even had circumstances where, within the trade union movement, which has prided itself over the years on being united in its common cause, in certain instances, there have been some people in the trade union movement who have not particularly been as sympathetic as they might be to the plight of those in public sector unions, in many cases because they've had to go through difficult times themselves. When you see that, you know it's very significant, when you even see some divisions there.

There are a lot of people now who are taking time out to take a shot at teachers, at hospital workers, at Hydro workers and people who are employed in the various civil services around the province, and are taking some glee in what's happening. I'm sure that the Treasurer, the Chair of Management Board and others in the government aren't rubbing their hands with glee at what they are doing and what they believe they have to do. I think it's important that we not simply all pounce on the public service, popular as that is politically. I think if people were to do polls, and the government certainly does, my guess would be that there

would be some considerable support for attacking the public service as being a privileged class.

While we all recognize the need for efficiency, the need for improvement, the need for productivity, the need for the delivery of service, the need for value for dollar, I think all of us should be cautious not to join in the unfair attacks on many public servants who have delivered services to the public over the years. That's always disconcerting when we're in difficult times as this.

Again, I know there are consequences. I want to talk about colleges and universities. It seems to me there's about \$250 million, if I can calculate correctly, which is going to be removed from the base of the universities in this province. I've discussed this with some people in the universities who've tried to deliver good service, who are trying to provide an excellent education for students who will be going out into an ever-increasingly competitive world.

If my calculation is correct, over the next three years, the government is going to require that the university sector eliminate from its base budget about \$250 million or a quarter of a billion dollars. That won't happen without some consequences for those universities, and I think we should be prepared, when the criticisms come in, for those kinds of criticisms, with that amount of money being taken out of the university sector.

I want to indicate as well some areas I'm quite interested in. I read with relish the columns by Tom Walkom in the Toronto Star, because Thomas Walkom is one of the people who I always thought was certainly left-wing, who has never disguised his left-wing tendencies. He must have been overjoyed in 1990 when finally we had elected in Ontario a socialist, or as they would like to call themselves, social democratic, I think is the term they use—

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** Social New Democrats.

**Mr Bradley:** Social New Democrats, the member for Chatham-Kent suggests.

His latest column—Tom Walkom has written many columns—says, "New NDP Breaks With Working Class." That's got to be mighty difficult, because that is essentially the sector that the NDP has been associated with. They haven't always been successful in garnering all the support from that sector, but certainly they have had significant support from the leadership, including many who sit in this House today, including my friend the member for Chatham-Kent.

**Mr Hope:** I still have my union card.

**Mr Bradley:** He still has his union card despite how he voted on the social contract legislation. I'm sure the men and women in his area will understand well where his real sympathies are as an individual.

So it is difficult being in government and having to



vote for some of the bills that the government brings forward, but I think some people understand that. Others, according to Tom Walkom, will not forget, and certainly Sid Ryan said that he would not forgive and forget, and that's rather interesting in itself.

I look at that circumstance. I feel sorry for so many of those people who are in that situation. I don't think there's any easy solution; I don't want to pretend that there is. But I can, I think, count on the fact that in subsequent election campaigns it'll be pretty hard to attack from the left, because the party has moved considerably to the right on the other side.

I certainly recommend to all government members the columns written by Mr Walkom, which from time to time are critical of the opposition parties but certainly have been attacking the governing party from the left, which is rather unusual in this Legislature. There are many people who will lament the fact that there isn't really a left-wing party remaining in the province of Ontario, unless it's one that is well to the left, the New Democratic Party, and it doesn't seem to have considerable popular support.

I've found a book here by Professor John Saywell. It is *Just Call Me Mitch: The Life of Mitchell F. Hepburn*, and now when I look across the floor at my good friend the member for York South, the Premier of the province of Ontario, I begin to see, as I read the book, some parallels between my friend Bob Rae and Mitch Hepburn, who had his clashes with unions in the province, as well. I had a slip of the tongue the other day and referred to the Premier as Mitch Rae instead of Bob Rae. I certainly apologize to the Premier for that, but it just came to mind, as I was reading this book, that there are many parallels today, and I know that New Democrats who attacked Mitch Hepburn in years gone by will certainly be forgetting to attack him in the future.

I read some interesting columns, as well, and I have tried to share those with members of the House because not everybody gets a chance to read all of these columns and some letters to the editor. Michael Girdlestone wrote a letter to the Brantford Expositor, and he must be a good friend of Mr Ward, the member for Brantford. I'm going to read the letter, for what it's worth. I just think members should be aware of what was said by Michael Girdlestone.

He says: "For as long as I can remember, I have supported the New Democratic Party. I have voted for it and promoted its policies. However, after hearing about Bob Rae's social contract, I have decided to terminate my support for the NDP.

"I feel, as many other Ontarians do, that"—and I'm quoting him, remember—"that Rae has lied to us and has failed to keep even one of his campaign promises. To put it bluntly, Rae is a charlatan. Rae is acting more like a Tory than a New Democrat. I do not feel that Rae, with his Conservative, pro-corporate mentality, can

even relate to the working man or woman. He is not supportive of the working class. This is shown by his attack upon the middle and lower-income classes in the form of higher sales taxes, cutbacks in proactive programs and lack of attempts to tax the corporations and upper class.

"Rae promised to tax corporations. He lied. Rae promised to improve our education system. He lied. Rae promised to support proactive social programs. He lied. Rae promised to maintain and improve our health care service. He lied. Rae promised to build the Ministry of Government Services' new computer centre in Brantford. He lied.

"Contrary to what many politicians think, voters will no longer support those who trample on their trust. Bob Rae and the NDP are living on borrowed time, for the landslide that put them into power will remove them from power with swift, blinding velocity.

"I will not support the NDP provincially in the future. Hopefully, all my fellow citizens will do the same." Then he finishes a line by saying: "Rae lied. He lied, he lied." Michael Girdlestone.

Now, I wouldn't go that far. I think Mr Girdlestone has taken a very critical approach to this government, and I wouldn't want to go that far because I like to be fair-minded. I recognize that economic circumstances changed, but I well recall, as some members who have not sat in this assembly before will recall, that the leader of the official opposition—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** The member endeavours to intervene. I simply say, and he will not recall this and I will, that the Premier, when he was in opposition, called the then Premier of the province a liar. We don't use that terminology in the House. You see, this is the kind of dialogue you get into. You say on one hand it's all right for Bob Rae to say it, but it's not all right for somebody to say it to Bob Rae.

You have to apply the same standards to everybody and that's where you New Democrats—you're so convinced of your case, you're so closed-minded—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Address the Chair, please.

**Mr Bradley:** —in that regard that you can't see it. I had an argument one day with one of your members who is in the cabinet at the present time and I got into that argument before about lying and who accuses who of lying and it's not allowed in this House. We've never permitted it and I think it's wise in the rules not to allow it because it garners disrespect for people. But what I am saying to people is, you have to apply those principles to everybody, and if it is wrong for somebody to accuse Premier Peterson of lying it is equally wrong for somebody to accuse Premier Rae of lying, because we assume that both gentlemen, being honourable members of this House, are not people who are going to

be lying.

I wanted to share with members of the House the viewpoint of a person who is a committed New Democrat and demonstrate how difficult it is in these times to be able to fulfil all those promises. People will now say: "There's virtually nobody left. We've had the Conservative Party, we've had the Liberal Party, we've had the New Democrats, and of all of them, we thought the New Democrats would be different and, in fact, they have not been." It even disillusioned me on some days of the week.

But that's what you face when you're in government. It's not easy to be in government. That's the kind of criticism you face on one side and I'm sure on the other side from people in chambers of commerce and—what is the coalition that's down the way of Chatham and London? The Taxpayers Coalition Ontario and there's the other one that Mr Brown is in charge of. There's another one down there that speaks on matters of this kind—the National Citizens' Coalition Inc speaks on matters of this kind. So the government is attacked from both sides and it makes it difficult to govern.

I want to deal with some other issues. Some of them will be rather localized and some of my colleagues from the Niagara Peninsula will be delighted that I raise them because I know they're concerned about them and have made representations directly to ministers. I look at the Niagara Peninsula Children's Centre which is very much in need of government funding. They are very concerned that the services they deliver to vulnerable children, children with great difficulties, aren't as good as they might be, as extensive and comprehensive as they might be because of what they would say is inadequate funding.

I certainly say, within the allocation that has been provided to the Minister of Health—I'm not saying "more"; I'm saying within that allocation—I guess I am, as the other members from the Niagara Peninsula are, making a bid that, out of those dollars, we allocate to our part of the province and to that facility sufficient funds for them to carry out their responsibilities in an appropriate way.

I also know that all of us have had a chance to deal with the children's aid societies or, as we call it, family and children's services. Under the social contract, they face some consequences but also, over and above that, their workers are working in facilities which are extremely difficult.

I certainly hope the government would look at the representations the government has had made to it on the needs for family and children's services in the Niagara region.

The regional municipality of Niagara is talking about cutting back some services in the field of senior citizens and perhaps some of the health services that it carries

out. Again, I think Brian Merrett, who is the chair, has indicated in a headline I saw the other day that there would be no new taxes that would be applied by the region.

My colleague—and that reminds me of a situation—the member for Mississauga North, I believe, was addressing this issue today. He talked about the fact that when a municipality cuts money from its budget where the province is paying 25% and the municipality is paying 75%, that program is cut off and the savings are much greater for the province than they are for the local municipality. No doubt they'll be making their representations to the appropriate ministers within the government in that regard.

"Teacher's College Graduates Face Bleak Job Prospects This Fall" is another article that appeared from Michael Adler in the St Catharines Standard. Indeed, those who have been able to get into teacher's college, because many of them have been forced to go south of the border in order to become educated as future teachers, have found that it's difficult to find jobs when they have come out into the workplace, into the job market. Again, part of that is because the various boards of education are being forced to cut back considerably and therefore are unable to hire new people, and many of the people who might retire are so uncertain about the provisions of the social contract that many of those people are holding on to their jobs rather than moving on, and in any event, we would say that it's unlikely that they would be replaced.

Another situation I wanted to deal with, as I come back to environment—I'm just reminded of the environment—I can recall during the last election campaign and even before that, the old issue of pop bottles and whether you're going to have soft drinks in pop bottles or cans. No matter how, as a minister or as a ministry or as a government, you tried to explain the fact that the recycling program was significantly dependent upon let's say the aluminum cans particularly and some of the metal cans to drive it, and some of the funding provided by the soft drink industry, there were still many, many people who believed that everything should be refillable or there should be deposits.

One vociferous critic in this regard, and I thought justifiably so as an opposition critic, was the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, who had the chance herself to be Minister of the Environment. Now she has been succeeded by Mr Wildman, the member for Algoma. But I notice that when it started to fall a little below 30%, there was considerable angst. In fact, Radio Noon and Metro Morning were having a competition with As It Happens and CBC Four to Six to see who could deal more with the issue of the ratio of non-refillables and refillables.

Lo and behold, my information is that the last ratio shows that now only 7% of the soft drinks are in fact



served in refillables. I have not heard a hue and cry. I am waiting for Christopher Thomas to do a show on it on CBC. I'm waiting for Matt Maychak and Metro Morning to phone and ask about this and say, "Isn't it awful?"

I recall one individual, one woman in St Catharines, who phoned my constituency office to indicate she was not going to vote Liberal this election because the ratio of pop bottles which are refillable and the cans had fallen slightly below 30%. If she's watching this program this afternoon, I hope she will note that it's down to 7% and that the problem has not been solved.

Not only has it not been solved, may I indicate, but in addition to this, no charges have been laid, mysteriously, against those who are in violation of those laws. The Minister of Environment and others are supposed to allow for a completely independent—

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** How many charges were laid when you were minister?

**Mr Bradley:** I'm glad you asked that question. The Minister of Municipal Affairs asks how many charges were laid while I was minister. I can tell you, many, many charges were laid on that particular issue and were successfully prosecuted here in Ontario.

**Hon Mr Philip:** How many?

**Mr Bradley:** No, a lot of charges were very successfully prosecuted in that period of time. I ask them only to look at the records and they'll find that's the case.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Name one. Give us a case.

**Mr Bradley:** I ask him to go and look in the records. It's right there in the records. You will find that since 1991, no charges have been laid against soft drink companies who are in violation of the law. So one of two things has happened: Either somebody has made a deal and everybody has agreed that there shouldn't be charges and there's some kind of something they get back for that—I'm not saying that's illegal or anything; I'm saying that's one thing that could happen—or second, somebody is blocking the charges.

1630

That would be of great consequence, because the investigation and enforcement branch of the Ministry of Environment and Energy is supposed to be totally independent of the minister or anybody else in the ministry. That's why, when I was the minister, I established the investigation and enforcement branch. That's why I made it distinctly separate from all other branches of the government, so it could be totally independent and what you would find is that the minister would be knowledgeable of any charges laid only when a press release was issued. The press release would be issued to the public and to the minister at the same time the charges had been laid.

Here we have a situation where the ratio has gone down to 7% and since 1991 no charges have been laid.

When that question was asked in the House, the minister did not have a good answer; the minister had no answer for that.

Am I being overly critical in this regard? No, I'm not. I'm simply pointing out that that was an example of an issue which was an extremely important issue at one time, and is no longer.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Point of order, the member for Simcoe West.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Mr Speaker, I think the member for St Catharines is making a number of important remarks, and it would be helpful if we had a quorum in this House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there a quorum, please?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Mr Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for St Catharines.

**Mr Bradley:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I want to continue. I see the member for Sarnia here, and he's a very good-humoured individual who likes to listen to and engage in debates in this House. I want to say to him that I well recall the days when if there was a thimbleful of anything spilled into the St Clair River, that also was good for at least six interviews on the CBC, as they would rush their cameras down and we would see the consequences of it.

Unfortunately, we continue to see many spills into the St Clair River. There was a promise made by a minister—and this, I knew, would bring my good friend the member for Chatham-Kent into the House—there was a promise made by the government that there would be a pipeline built and that the government was going to spend the full amount of money.

Now, I know that it is difficult sometimes. Governments make the promises, and sometimes economic reality makes it difficult to deliver. Everybody who fought down in that area for the environment said that the government should be contributing a significant amount of money for a pipeline which would bring water from up in the northern portions down to Wallaceburg so they would not have to draw their water from the St Clair River.

There was a promise made. The former Minister of the Environment, now the Minister of Health, made a promise that there would be a pipeline built, and there were announcements and a big fanfare. I remember one writer from the Globe and Mail followed Bob Rae across the province, and there were three different inaccurate stories on that day, but one of the things that was reported was, on that particular issue, there had already been some consideration work done on it, but the government decided it would pay the full cost of

that particular pipeline.

Well, I thought the pipeline might be built by now, but it's not built. There's still some time. I know my good friend the member for Chatham-Kent will be working very hard to see that it's built—

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** We gave 100% funding.

**Mr Bradley:** And with 100% of the funding, we still don't see it built. I wonder how this can happen.

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** Point of order here.

**Mr Bradley:** I don't think this is going to be a point of order.

**Mr Huget:** Mr Speaker, the member for St Catharines knows full well that we've kept our promises and the municipalities backed out of theirs.

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is not a point of order. Thank you. I would remind the members not to interject.

**Mr Bradley:** I have the member for Etobicoke West here to perhaps assist me, but if the provincial government was spending 100% on the pipeline, why would the pipeline not be built? Why would we want to blame municipal mayors when the provincial government was already going to pay 100%?

**Hon Ruth Grier:** Because there's capital and there's operating.

**Mr Bradley:** Oh, so they're not paying 100%. All right. That's fine. I just wanted to get that clear. It wasn't 100%.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** That's right, because the operating costs are really the big costs. They're long-term costs.

**Mr Bradley:** All right. I've had it clarified by the member for Etobicoke West. He's been extremely helpful in bringing this to our attention, because one always has to look at that.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. There are questions and comments that you can use at the end. I will not accept interjections.

**Mr Bradley:** I want to now talk about the conservation authorities and the difficulties they're facing. I have found that even people who are not rabid environmentalists, who aren't ardent environmentalists, care about conservation and conservation authorities. People who normally may not support some of the activities of individual environmental groups still want to see saved those lands which will be of benefit to future generations and the children and adults of today.

We find the conservation authorities making representations to all three parties and saying, "With the new provisions in this budget brought in by the NDP government, the last provincial budget, we're going to have a situation where we're going to have to sell off environ-

mentally sensitive lands."

I'm sure that when the government was coming up with ways to bleed more money out of the taxpayers, it didn't consider these consequences. I would be one who would applaud—I'm sure my colleagues in the Conservative Party would applaud as well—if the government would say: "Look, we were wrong, we didn't understand the consequences of this tax and now we're prepared to withdraw this provision which removes a tax exemption and a method of operating for conservation authorities which wasn't costly to them. We think we've been wrong." If the government said, "We're withdrawing it," I think it would get a hearty round of applause from all members of the House and certainly would, at the same time, be saving that important land.

Conservation authorities have some good ideas on how to save money. If the government wants to save money, I think the government would be wise to listen to those who sat on conservation authorities so that can happen.

I want to go back to the Niagara Peninsula again and say that I had met with the local firemen from the St Catharines fire department, representatives of the union, who had expressed some considerable concern about their pension funds might be used. They were happy with the way it had been invested in the past. They were concerned that the control of those investments would fall out of their hands.

As a result, I've sent letters to the appropriate minister and I have also presented petitions in this House. I hope the government will allay those fears that they are going to raid the pension funds of the province and use those moneys for purposes that the members may not be in favour of and perhaps place them in jeopardy. I know the government will want to allay those concerns, and that's why I raise this issue in the House today.

I also want to talk about something that is near and dear to those of us who reside in the Niagara Peninsula, and that is the ward and the facilities available for kidney patients at the Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines. All of us who are the local members had a chance to tour, along with some of the patients and the very dedicated staff, those facilities at Hotel Dieu. We all fought for an appropriate allocation so that the deplorable conditions which existed in that particular unit could be improved considerably, and an appropriate announcement was made. The member for St Catharines-Brock and I, and I think the member for Lincoln, the member for Niagara Falls, were present as the government finally provided those funds to allow that program to proceed.

1640

Now, what we're always concerned about is the length of time it takes from approval to the completion of those projects. All of us in the Niagara Peninsula will be happy when we can go to cut the ribbon when it's



finally completed and those services are there for kidney patients, since we've all had a chance to communicate directly with them.

The other hospital, St Catharines General Hospital, has an important program under way for renovations. The emergency ward has to be appropriately expanded and improved and updated and long-term care facilities changed around. So that's significant. We will be watching with care to see that that promise is fulfilled.

I had a call from a woman the other day at my constituency office who has expressed several times to my constituency office a concern about the lack of long-term care. She wanted the integrated homemaker program brought to the Niagara Peninsula. She has also contacted, no doubt, the member for St Catharines-Brock and would like to see services provided so that she can carry on her employment and still look after her husband, who has suffered from illness.

I know that those of us who represent the Niagara Peninsula once again will be making representations on behalf of this individual and on behalf of all individuals who need this particular service. So I say today to the minister, who is watching this on a monitor in his office, that this is very important to our part of the province.

I want to talk a bit about the issue of crime and security. I am concerned that people are becoming increasingly fearful, and with some justification, about even moving around in their own communities. Even last night, I was coming home from a graduation—and I want to congratulate the students at Scottlea elementary school. I had the opportunity to make a presentation of what was called the James J. Bradley Citizenship Award to a youngster, to Jennifer Wells. Jennifer Wells is a very deserving student. I happened to make it home last night after making a 90-minute speech in the House, then coming back late last night to be back in the House, as witnessed by other members here. But I want to congratulate that student. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to make that presentation.

Something interesting happened on the way home. I decided I would walk home from the school, and as I crossed the street—I moved rather rapidly so I wouldn't be hit by a car—I was walking behind a car with a woman alone in the car. In years gone by, probably nothing would be thought of that. The person, seeing out of the side of her eye a person coming across the street, even dressed up in a suit and not looking particularly threatening—I could hear the door locking quickly.

That's unfortunate, and I must say that I've approved of some of the initiatives the government has taken to provide services, particularly for vulnerable women who have been the victims very often of violence. But I thought that particular incident more than anything demonstrated the fear that some people have today of strangers, people who they don't particularly know or

aren't aware of, coming nearby.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This is an interesting story and I think we should have a quorum to hear it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Table, is there a quorum?

**Acting Table Clerk (Ms Lisa Freedman):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mr Bradley:** Speaking of the issue of crime and security, everyone in this House would be aware that those of us who represent St Catharines and district have had a pall over the city for some time because of some unfortunate murders that have taken place.

The name Kristen French is a name which is known now not only to people in our community, but to people across Ontario and Canada and even into the United States as an innocent, nice young girl who was coming home from Holy Cross secondary school near Easter time last year, walking through her own neighbourhood, through a church parking lot, in the middle of an afternoon. If one could say, "Where would a person be safe?" those are three circumstances that might meet the criteria of being safe. This person was kidnapped and ultimately murdered, and all of St Catharines has been saddened by this. I won't get into the details of the case because the case is before the courts. It wouldn't be appropriate.

Leslie Mahaffy is another individual, a young person whose body was found in Lake Gibson at the edge of the city of St Catharines, and again we have been very concerned about this. There have been other people who have been victims of crime, people I have known personally, who have been kidnapped and assaulted and near death. It seems to me that we have to, as a society, address this problem, the problem of violence and the problem of crime.

There are two ways of addressing it, two ways of looking at it. One is to look at the root causes, and that's important, to endeavour as a society to remove those root causes. But those who are the victims of crime cannot wait for us to remove all of those causes to have crime disappear.

Therefore, it requires an appropriate allocation of resources to our police forces and alterations to some of our laws to ensure that those who would perpetrate crimes upon innocent victims in our province, in our country, are appropriately dealt with and that there's a preventive measure which will reduce the risk considerably. We can never entirely remove that risk, but it's important to reduce it.

I'm sure that if you said to the people of St Catharines, "Would you be supportive of those changes in laws, of the increased allocation of resources for those purposes and of the removal of the root causes of

crime?" you would certainly find almost unanimous support among people in our part of the province, and I hope that the levels of government that are responsible will do so.

Considerable mention has been made of the Young Offenders Act. Those who drew up the Young Offenders Act were not trying to throw the doors open to crime, were not trying to protect, as some might say, young criminals. They were attempting to address a difficult problem. But I think in addressing it, they have brought about circumstances that have virtually decreased any fear that certain young people have of authority and of law and of respect for society. As a result, many of the crimes that are committed today are committed by those young people who know the system far better than others and who exploit that system. That's most unfortunate, particularly when one considers that many of the victims of those crimes by those young people are in fact other young people.

I don't think our society can tolerate violence. I don't think our society can tolerate the kind of hooliganism that we've seen on so many occasions. Sometimes it's a so-called celebration of a sporting event, where one team wins and the people from that team have fans, so-called, who are supposed to go out on a rampage that night. That is not acceptable. Clearly, the good sports fans are not those who are doing so; it is those who take advantage of it.

Society has to come down hard on those people to set an appropriate example and to make sure that all segments of society are protected. The same can be said, in my own personal view, of those who use social causes and then go on rampages because of social causes.

I believe in the right of assembly. I believe in the right of protesting in front of this building, in front of other locations, in the streets. I am a strong supporter of that. That's what our democratic government is all about. But when people use social ills as an excuse to hurt others or to wantonly damage property or to riot, I don't think we should condone that particular activity, but rather should encourage people to go through the channels that are open in a democratic system to seek redress. When there are apologists for those people who would break the laws in that connection, I think it does not help those circumstances.

1650

There have been many people provoked over the years on picket lines in the province of Ontario and in other jurisdictions, people who have withdrawn their services in a legal strike, which they have constitutionally and legally the right to do, and have had other people who have attempted to take away their jobs. Now, from the outside that perhaps is not viewed with the same degree of venom, if I may say that, as it is from inside, if it's your job that's being taken away. It's

always easy when you're watching television or reading a news story to condemn those who want to protect their rights as individual workers and not have others take away their jobs.

When those people have shown so much restraint under great provocation over the years, it seems to me that others who have social ills or other ills that they wish to redress can show the same degree of restraint that many have had to over the years when provoked rather considerably, either by those who were trying to break a strike openly or by those who are crossing picket lines. We're not talking about a wildcat. We're not talking about an illegal strike. We're talking about legitimate strikes in this province. So governments must provide that kind of protection for our society.

I happen to know the French family. I think many people do in St Catharines, as a result particularly of this case. They have gone through an awful lot. Not to their liking, they've reached a celebrity status. That's not a status they want; that's a status that is forced upon them by the news media, which is naturally interested in these stories. I certainly feel for them when they are confronted with the constant questions which are directed to them over the years, and it's now into the second year.

I hope that we as a government and the federal government as a government will address those problems of crime and security, because everybody wants to feel secure in their own community. Sometimes we in this House become a bit detached from that. You have to sit down and talk to people, and now I think all of us as politicians recognize that more and more as we're walking down the street, people are stopping us to give us their viewpoint on issues.

As I mentioned, last night, leaving this particular event that I was at, I had another person who stopped me along the street and for about 10 minutes indicated to me what her views were on a number of issues. I think that's important that we know what the local people are thinking and that we try to address the issues they are particularly interested in in a meaningful way.

Because it's so important to those of us in the peninsula and to our entire province, I want to address the problems confronted by the automotive industry in Ontario, because Ontario is essentially the automotive industry in Canada. Yes, there are some other plants in other provinces, but certainly not to the extent of those that are in Ontario.

It is my view that governments of any political stripe and of any level of government must recognize the importance of the automotive industry, both in terms of assembly and the automotive parts industry, to our province. If you look at the multiplier effect of the jobs and the operations in the automotive industry, you recognize that it is extremely meaningful to our economy. The steel industry supplies the auto industry, and



the plastics industry, the cloth industry, the rubber industry. There are so many various plants that supply our automotive industry, and automotive sales are very important to keep that industry booming.

I have recommended in this House on a number of occasions, a recommendation rejected by the Treasurer because he believes there is a need for funding for revenues, that we remove the special tax which has been placed on automobiles in this province, which I've referred to as a tax on auto workers. The reason is that I think it has a dampening effect on the purchases that can be made in Ontario.

I have indicated on many occasions that I believe two problems would be assisted by this. One is the environmental problem. By getting people to purchase their new vehicles, we have people who then are stimulating the economy. That's the economic one, where you are stimulating the economy by making those purchases.

The second is the elimination of pollution, or the environmental aspect. If people went out and everybody in Ontario today were able to replace his or her old clunker with a brand-new vehicle, two things would happen: First of all, the fuel economy would be for the most part better in those new vehicles, so therefore that helps the environment; second, the pollution control equipment in those new vehicles is superior pollution control equipment. I hope that the Treasurer, and I know I have support among some members of the government caucus, would withdraw that particular tax which I think could stimulate the automotive industry and help us environmentally.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: According to the rules, doesn't there have to be a member from each caucus in the House? I notice there are no Conservatives in the House today.

**The Deputy Speaker:** No. There needs to be a quorum, but everything is in order.

**Mr Bradley:** I'll get on to another tax now that I think could be helpful to everybody. I think if the provincial Treasurer, now known as the provincial Minister of Finance, were to, for a period of time, withdraw the sales tax as well as the special tax on automobiles—he calls it the gas guzzler tax—if he were to remove the sales tax as well for a period of six months, nine months or a year, he would see that people would make some purchases of vehicles, particularly newer vehicles, and that would be helpful to the economy.

So two things could be done for the automotive industry: One is removing the so-called gas guzzler tax, and the second would be removing the sales tax, one of them permanently, the other for a period of time. I recognize that the government needs its revenue and it can't remove it for ever, but I think it would be very helpful, because anybody who has purchased a vehicle

lately—and some people out of necessity have been compelled to do so—would find that the tax, the GST and the provincial sales tax and the special tax on vehicles and so on, the costs associated are extremely significant. I hope that members of the governing caucus will be prepared to support that.

I was going to call for a quorum, but I don't think I will. I think I'll just have a drink of water.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** Thanks to the clean water agency.

**Mr Bradley:** Well, there's an issue. I'm glad that issue was raised. I heard somebody mention the clean water agency. Members of the government can be very helpful in suggesting matters we could talk about.

There are three agencies being set up by the government. The purpose of all of them is to get this off the books and put them on separate agencies. That way the Premier can come back and say, "Well, isn't this great, we've reduced the deficit." W.A.C. Bennett in British Columbia, the father of Bill Bennett but Premier a long time ago, used to use that very trick. His nickname was Wacky Bennett and he was a social creditor, right-wing politician. He would take the debts from the provincial government and assign them to these crown agencies and then say, "We don't have any debt in the province of British Columbia." I look at this circumstance and say we're seeing the same thing happening in Ontario. We see three agencies set up and we see tolls being placed on the highway.

One of the selling points in terms of transportation, in terms of tourism in this province has been that we could say to our American friends and those from other provinces that if you come to Ontario, you're not going to be confronted with the cost of those annoying tolls which are placed on roadways in other countries and perhaps in other provinces. But our government has broken new ground, at least new ground in the 1990s, and has announced that it's going to have toll roads in this province as yet another tax.

1700

I know that the people who were looking forward to funding for public transportation are disappointed that, as a result of the recent announcements, the GO Transit is diminishing its service. A lot of people use GO Transit. It avoided the need to bring vehicles into Metropolitan Toronto on a daily basis, and that need is going to be increased now that those services have been cut back.

I want to talk about something else—this bill may come before the House; I hope it never appears before the House—and that is a cash cow that this government is embarking upon, very attractive but a major problem. I wish I had an article from the Toronto Star that was in the weekend Toronto Star, I think last weekend, by the writer in the field of automobiles, because it dealt with

the new cameras that you're going to give to the police to take photographs of drivers in this province. This is something that I consider to be totally a cash cow.

More and more, because of the need for revenue in this province, we're seeing police forces and quasi-police forces using ways to raise money rather than concentrating their full efforts in areas I believe would be more productive in terms of fighting real problems. For instance, I notice in Metropolitan Toronto, right here in the city of Toronto, one used to, in certain areas, be able to park overnight where there were meters.

There were no signs that say you can't do it, but you could park overnight. It wasn't hurting anybody, it wasn't a loading zone, they weren't removing snow. But all of a sudden they're now enforcing some obscure provincial law that I would say most of these people don't even know about, and that law is that apparently you cannot park for longer than three hours in one spot.

Now, there are some people who have parked in the same spot for eight years and have gone down to a side street where there's no signage and have parked a vehicle there, and if at 8:01 in the morning the vulture is there—I'm sorry, the person who signs the tickets is there to sign a ticket, one accepts that. That is the way it is.

But apparently now they have decided that they are going to give \$20 tickets to people who happen to park overnight. This is, in my view, something they shouldn't be doing. They should be spending their time fighting crime instead of raising money or towing vehicles away. You watch the vultures pull up with their tow trucks, one person putting the ticket on, who should be fighting crime in Toronto not putting tickets on cars. Then you see the tow truck going away—and if that isn't a vulture business what is—the tow truck towing it to some yard, and it costs well over \$100 to get it back, I am told.

I think their time could be spent more productively. This is my fear what's going to happen with police: They're going to sit there with the cameras on the highway, and when you're doing 65 miles an hour on a 60-mile-an-hour road or 100 and whatever that equals on a 100-kilometre-an-hour highway and you're keeping up with the traffic, they're going to sit there and take pictures and give out fines.

The people they should be chasing, in my view, are the characters who are weaving in and out of lanes, driving dangerously and in conditions of bad climate driving very poorly or the left-lane bandits, who are sitting there going less than the speed limit in the left lane and annoying everybody behind them, or on two-lane highways, those who are leading the grand parade. If you don't think there are parades allowed on provincial highways, just go out on some of the two-lane highways and watch the 96-car parade. What is happening is the person at the beginning of the parade is

forcing people to pass constantly and we have the head-on collisions.

I think all you're going to do when you let the police set up those cameras is make them collectors of money, when they should be spending their time (a) fighting crime and (b) getting the drivers who really cause problems on our highways. I hope that the government will reconsider that. I know it sounds good because they will always say, "Speed kills." There are a lot of other things that kill on the highway and are much more dangerous.

If you're nailing drivers who are not appropriately behind the wheel, who are driving dangerously, in many ways I understand that, but I just hope this government will not embark upon a cash cow, giving the police the opportunity to sit there and collect money instead of fighting crime and nailing those drivers who are genuinely causing a problem.

I suspect that the attraction is too good, that it's a cash cow and that some day we may see this happen. But I don't think you're going to improve the driving habits in Ontario by doing that. There are many other ways of doing that, but I'm just reminded that was one of the great initiatives that this government was thinking of and one that I hope the government House leader in his wisdom will persuade the minister to drop from consideration.

I want to look at the future and the future prosperity of Ontario. I want to be one who says that I am optimistic that some day Ontario will be in better shape than it is today. I heard the Premier chastising the leader of the third party the other day, telling him he's running down Ontario all the time, and that's an old tactic. I watched Bill Davis do that, and probably David Peterson might have done that when the opposition asked questions, tell you to be positive about things.

Well, the role of the opposition people is to call the government to account, and sometimes it sounds like criticism which is directed at Ontario. It's directed at particular governments and particular government policies, legislation and regulations, and I think that should be separate.

But I want to say that in the future, as we pull out of this recession, as I hope we will and as I believe we must some day, I hope that we're positioning ourselves so that we can get the investment that's going somewhere.

My gosh, there's a lot more competition for that investment than there used to be. When Canada came out of the Second World War, we were very favoured. We weren't hit by the bombs during the Second World War. Many countries were devastated, and as we came out of the Second World War, we had a great advantage. We had a good industry. Our people had died and fought in that war, but in terms of material damage, we



had not suffered that in Canada. So we didn't have much competition around the world. Today we face considerable competition, and that means that we have to be able to attract the kind of business interests and investment that are going to produce jobs in our part of the province.

I'm not one, and there are many who fit in this category today, who is prepared to abandon traditional industries. I understand that you have to look to the future. People will say you've got to have knowledge-based industries and you've got to look at perhaps jobs that won't be as high-paying but they're in the service field. Yes, I hope there are jobs there. I hope we're in the new fields that are going to be good for us in the future. But I hope we don't abandon some of the old industries.

As I look around this House, I see members who represent areas that have some of those older industries, traditional industries: the government House leader, the member for Hamilton West. Both represent Hamilton, and they have the steel industry. There are other industries there as well, but the steel industry has been exceedingly important. Now, I hear people say out there, the gurus of the future, that somehow we should abandon, you know, say this is not an industry of the future; we should be looking at something else and not be propping up these industries or trying to defend these industries. I am diametrically opposed to that kind of thinking.

I understand those industries are changing. I've been through the Hilton works in Hamilton and I've been through Nanticoke. They're different plants, and I am quite amazed by, and to a certain extent alarmed by, the automation I see. When I went through the Hilton plant there were far more people working on the floor. I went through the Nanticoke plant and there seemed to be about five people working in a glassed-in area and pushing buttons and machines were doing everything down below, with perhaps the odd employee down there looking at something, and that's automation.

That's a point that has to be made over and over again, that these changes that people advocate, an automated industry means fewer jobs. They may be high-paying jobs, but they're far fewer jobs. The other example I saw was at Clarabelle in Sudbury when I went through the Inco process. I used to live in Sudbury at one time, and there were a lot of people; when I lived there, there were about 21,000 people employed by Inco and Falconbridge put together, but even Inco had a very large workforce. When I lived there, Mine, Mill was the union that represented them; subsequently, it was the Steelworkers.

1710

I went through a plant at Clarabelle and I thought the plant was closed. I said, "Are you closed down for the summer or for a month this summer?" They said, "No,

this plant is operating." There were no employees in it. We went up to the control centre, which is glassed in and has all these dials that I certainly wouldn't understand, with all these gauges and so on, and there were a few people up there operating the entire plant. I was quite surprised when I saw this happening.

Those of you who have worked in industry, who have represented workers in industry, must have faced great difficulty when trying to deal with this, trying to even talk to your own employees about how this may be inevitable but it's going to mean far fewer jobs.

I went through the Ford glass plant in Niagara Falls, which by the way is closing, unfortunately. I remember there was a robot in there and the robot was caged in. I went through with a representative of the union at the time and a representative of the company—

**Mr Jim Wilson:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe we have a quorum in this House.

**The Speaker:** Will the table officer count.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member may continue with his remarks.

**Mr Bradley:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that opportunity.

I was talking about the robot being caged in at the Niagara Falls plant, and I asked the individuals who were conducting the tour why this was. It was something new, and very hard for those who are employed to accept that kind of automation that might remove some of those jobs. Eventually that caging would've been removed, but that's the kind of difficulty that one encounters.

I want to deal as well with another issue that I think is important. I don't generally like dealing with federal issues in the provincial House, but in the peninsula and other places we face the consequences of the free trade agreement with the United States, signed by Prime Minister Mulroney and I think President Reagan at that time, or President Bush rather at that time—it may have been Reagan.

**Mr Stockwell:** Reagan.

**Mr Bradley:** It was Reagan. It's that long ago. The member for Etobicoke West is right—and then the NAFTA agreement, the North American free trade agreement.

I happen to think that neither of those agreements contained the kind of safeguards that will be necessary to protect our workers from unfair competition and that there are consequences. Certainly, the recession has resulted in a lot of job losses, but at the same time, the recession, compared with more competitive trade circumstances, has had an adverse effect on our econ-

omy.

Premier Peterson, when he was Premier, suggested that the free trade agreement without those safeguards would in fact result in the deindustrialization of Ontario, or had that potential, and Premier Peterson indicated his opposition to that particular agreement. All of us have recognized the need to trade with the United States and other countries in the world, but if we're going to sign agreements, they have to be the kind of agreements that are going to allow for fairness in trade and not simply allow the United States Congress and other agencies of the American government to continue to dictate the provisions of trade agreements.

There is in my area considerable concern about the agreement that would now include Mexico, because Mexico, it is generally anticipated, does not have the same kind of labour laws, environmental laws and other laws that tend to be an additional cost in the United States and Canada. While I notice that one of the automotive companies is about to make an announcement of a move of some jobs from Mexico to the United States, I suspect the reason for that might well be, although I cannot substantiate this, to assist in persuading Congress and the administration to accept the North American free trade agreement.

If you're signing agreements, you have to have the ability to have sanctions, to have an impartial arbiter. I'm going to get some help from the member for Chatham-Kent who agrees with me on this issue. You have to be able to have that kind of assistance. We didn't have any kind of adjustment available to us, which was necessary.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Chatham-Kent indicates that there's a very good photograph here. Lara, who is our page from St Catharines, and I are in this particular photograph that he holds up for the television camera now. I want to congratulate all of the pages who have served in this session because they do such a good job in such a friendly fashion and they don't even get very much money paid for that, although I must warn them that they're fortunate they are escaping the social contract provisions.

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** They don't make \$30,000.

**Mr Bradley:** They're under \$30,000, the member for St Catharines-Brock appropriately points out to me.

We're talking about trade agreements, to go back to those. We have to have the necessary protection. A good example of a good trade agreement was in fact the free trade pact in automobiles, the auto pact, signed by Prime Minister Pearson and President Johnson in 1965. Subsequently, the advantages of that disappeared under the recent administration in Ottawa.

That was something that benefited both Canada and

the United States. We didn't always like the way it went sometimes, but we thought there was fairness with it. There were good jobs created in Canada, good jobs created in the United States and everybody benefited.

As a result of the free trade agreement and now as a result of NAFTA, we're seeing many of those provisions eroded and our workers are much more vulnerable today than they might have been immediately after the signing of that pact.

I think during the federal election campaign, which will be coming up—that's why I'm not going to deal extensively with it here—there will be many issues to be dealt with.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Will you be running?

**Mr Bradley:** I will not be running. The member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore asks will I be running. It is my intention to run in the next provincial election, in the provincial constituency of St Catharines, and not to run for mayor, as I heard I was running, or to run for the federal House, as I heard I was running. I've enjoyed the opportunity to serve the people so much for the past 16 years in this Legislature that I intend to continue on if the people of St Catharines see fit to re-elect me.

Another matter I wanted to deal with before time ran out was the way in which dissident members have been dealt with in the government caucus, because sometimes I worry about them. I worry about them very much, because some of them are close by.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Chatham-Kent notes there's a tinge of grey coming in as a result.

My good friend Ron Hansen, the member for Lincoln, I recall being very concerned about the tobacco tax. He stood in the Legislature, an independent-minded individual, fighting for his constituents and other farming people, and voted against that tax.

I thought, "Well, the whip and others will explain to him this is rather serious," because you're supposed to vote with the government on these matters. Instead, he was bounced as the Chairman of the finance and economic affairs committee, bounced right out of the job. He lost whatever they get paid, \$10,000 extra or something, whatever the Chairman got, and lost the job as a result.

I got up and raised the issue with the Premier, because I wanted to help out my friend and colleague from Lincoln. I raised the issue with the Premier and he denied having anything to do with it. Everybody who sits in this House today knows that the Premier has everything to do with everything and if he doesn't he's very angry.

Now, who else did I see was in trouble on the other side?

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** Not me.



1720

**Mr Bradley:** Not the member for Durham East because he serves his government well. He's uncritical, he's enthusiastic and he bows to a photograph of the Premier every day, I think, as he goes by. Is that not correct? I think that's what he does.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** I won't get into what ceremony he performs on behalf of the Premier, but he is very loyal to the Premier.

But the member for Welland-Thorold, a person who from time to time expresses a dissident point of view, I saw when the NDP caucus was at—you wouldn't be there, Mr Speaker, because you're neutral. But when they gathered together at the palatial surroundings in Niagara-on-the-Lake, there were two members with their lunches in brown bags. The member for Chatham-Kent leaves as I mention this. These two members felt that somehow it was inappropriate for New Democrats to be talking about restraint in the palatial surroundings of Niagara-on-the-Lake and be eating whatever it was, caviar or—was it not?

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** The member for St Catharines-Brock tells me it wasn't caviar. Tuna-fish sandwiches? Okay, it was tuna-fish sandwiches. Anyway, I saw the member on television. I know he has an aversion to television cameras, but the cameras came right over and took photographs of the two members eating out of the brown bags. I was worried because I remembered when the NDP would have gathered at Port Elgin—a good place, the CAW centre at Port Elgin. I thought they would be there, helping the brothers and sisters by booking it.

**Interjection:** Too expensive.

**Mr Bradley:** Somebody said it was too expensive. I know one thing: It would be unionized and, second, a very nice place to go and, third, the Canadian Auto Workers, who have suffered some losses in terms of the amount of money they get in dues because of layoffs and so on, would have appreciated it. I wouldn't have been critical because I would have known it was a competitive price and it was unionized and everything would have been fine. Mr Kormos and the member for Wentworth East would not have to take their lunch to either one of those.

I remember the member—he was the Chair and, I was told, a good Chair of the standing committee on resources development—Mr Kormos. Opposition people said he was fairminded and others even on the government side must have believed that. All of a sudden, the government House leader gets up and he reads the list of committee chairs and Peter Kormos is not on that. Well, you can imagine the people of Welland-Thorold thinking that their member again was going to be

penalized \$10,000 or something like that by the Premier, was going to lose his prestigious position, and I was quite concerned at that.

I even heard at the provincial council last weekend that there were people who tried to speak about certain issues, who were cut off and they're now writing letters. I guess there wasn't enough time, probably not enough time. They're now writing letters to the Premier about this and providing some copies to other people.

I'm wondering, for instance, whether Malcolm Buchanan had the opportunity to express his views as extensively as he could have, because Malcolm has been a long-time supporter of the New Democratic Party. He and I have engaged in a dialogue over the years about the New Democratic Party and what it stands for, and I expected Malcolm would be up speaking and everyone would be listening very carefully and you'd give him the opportunity to speak. If I recall hearing this correctly, Malcolm was not allowed to speak.

**Interjection:** He wasn't a delegate.

**Mr Bradley:** He wasn't a delegate, somebody said, but I can recall in the past that when he was speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party, when he was helping Bob Rae to be elected in the provincial by-election in York South, nobody stopped him from speaking on that occasion. If Malcolm is watching, I'll tell him that I'm here to fight for Malcolm and his opportunity to speak before the provincial council of the NDP, and all those other people who, because of time, no doubt, didn't have the chance to have their issues addressed.

I want to wish Mel Swart a happy birthday because Mel Swart is one of my favourite New Democrats, and a CCFer before that. He's celebrating his birthday this week. I won't say how many years, but he's over 70 years old; I can tell you that. Mel has been the epitome of what a CCFer, a New Democrat, should be and I'm sure that all of us in this House wish Mel Swart a happy birthday today.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for St Catharines for his contribution to this debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Hope:** I enjoy the member for St Catharines' comments at times. I noticed his production of talking about the pipeline. I must correct the record most appropriately. As he indicated, yes, it was the Liberals who committed only 75% of the funding, I think it was, one-time, which only cost about \$20 million. It escalated its price, and then when we finally got into government, we committed to try to get the citizens of that community of Wallaceburg and North Kent clean water.

It's unfortunate that circumstances prevailed in those affected communities, but the communities were the one community had rejected the idea, and now this govern-

ment pursues making sure that the citizens of Dresden and that community effectively receive clean drinking water, as the member quite well knows about the effects of nitrates that lie in that water system. We will be trying to clean that up.

It was interesting to listen to his comments about the attack on the auto workers coming from the auto worker section of the CAW. He forgot to bring about one that was very detrimental, the rubber worker tax, the tire tax that we all hated to pay. I notice he was very quiet about forgetting that one. But I remember the dramatic impact it had on all the rubber workers in the Kitchener area. No wonder we had to close one of the plants down. Maybe now that we've got rid of the tire tax, it'll put one of those tire plants back. I think it's important, not only for those workers, but also for the industry itself.

But on the free trade issue I must say that, yes, he does project it appropriately, but I'm just curious how Jean Chrétien's going to renegotiate something he doesn't have, and I wonder what your position is. Are you saying: "Kill the bill. Get rid of free trade"? Are you saying, also like your Liberal leader, to renegotiate something that you have no powers to renegotiate? I would just like some clarification from the member opposite, who I know is always clear.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I just want to commend the member for St Catharines for his eloquent remarks. I think he does a good job of representing his riding and I hope he runs again. I don't think anyone can beat him in the riding of St Catharines. He's kind of got a monopoly there and the good people of St Catharines choose to send him back time and time again to this Legislature.

He talked about taxes in his remarks, though, and I was having a bit of a chuckle back here, because when the Liberals talk about taxes—they're now trying to catch the public imagination to pretend that they somehow didn't overtax us when they were in office and that they somehow weren't the cause of the New Democrats' problems now that they're in office, with respect to the debt and deficit—I do find that a little amusing and I even note that the member for St Catharines was having a difficult time keeping a straight face during parts of that.

I, however, was surprised that the member for St Catharines didn't mention one of the latest schemes offered by the Ontario government, and that is that the Ontario taxpayers will be paying out \$30,000 so that 20 Canadian auto workers can spend a week at a retreat discussing humour. I hope that comes up a couple of times this evening, because I would really be very curious as to what the explanation is, in terms of having an agency of the government spend \$30,000 of taxpayers' money so that 20 people—that's \$1,500 apiece in terms of government grant—can go and discuss

humour for a week on a retreat. I think that's a misuse of the taxpayers' dollars, something that, when the NDP was in opposition, it certainly wouldn't have allowed to happen. They'd have been hanging from the chandeliers in opposition to such a waste of taxpayers' money.

Once again, I commend the member for St Catharines and hope that we'll have many more opportunities to hear him speak eloquently in this House.

1730

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** I want to thank the member for St Catharines for some very interesting views on a whole lot of different things, always, of course, from the point of view of Niagara.

One of the things he didn't mention that I thought he might—I know it could be very near and dear to his heart—is the issue of the cost of waste disposal in the Niagara area. The cost of diversion and cost of recycling is very high. You must also realize that with 12 different municipalities all involved in this, we have at the moment many studies going on, a club approach in various parts of the peninsula. We have public advisory committees that are now doing lots of things. We have many lawyers and consultants who are being paid by the taxpayers down there. I think the people of the region also are saying, "Please do not be spending our taxpayers' money on lawyers and consultants."

I think the member will also know that in the past, maybe 20 years ago, when regional governments were set up, nearly every region in Ontario except the Niagara region had the responsibility for waste management at the regional level. So I wanted to ask the member, does he think that in the region of Niagara, the responsibility should be at the regional level, and would this save us money?

**Mr Turnbull:** I was very interested in the line of reasoning that my colleague the member for St Catharines brought forward about the government cutting back the property tax grants to conservation authorities, and the total ignoring by the government of the proposal by those authorities to save very significant amounts of money, several millions of dollars which would go towards paying the taxes if the government were to allow them to. But the government has seemed to decide that it knows better, and all it's doing is pulling the tax grants from those authorities, which are protecting our wetlands and very environmentally sensitive areas of the province.

It's rather a surprise to think that this government, which in opposition was always portraying itself as the people who would protect the environment—I guess in the words of that famous politician Robert K. Rae QC, "That was then and this is now." This is now, when the government absolutely ignores the plight of the conservation authorities, which I may say were set up by the Conservative government to protect those sensitive environmental areas of the province, and those areas



which people from the towns could visit and appreciate. There are floodplains and there are very essential reasons for maintaining those wetlands and those floodplains, but what is the government doing? They're turning their back on it. Potentially, those lands are going to be lost because they'll have to be sold off to pay the taxes.

**The Speaker:** The member for St Catharines has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Bradley:** There were so many remarks that I won't have the opportunity to respond in the kind of detail that I would like to each one, but I would like to mention first of all the pipeline that was going to be constructed in the area of the far west of the province of Ontario. A commitment certainly was made by the previous government—the commitment was made also by this government—to pay 100% of the cost.

I would think that if the danger to the water supply is as it was described by members of the New Democratic Party in opposition, certainly the government would be proceeding with that construction project regardless of other protests. But apparently, now that we have an NDP government, it appears that the water is suddenly clean, so perhaps there's not a problem there any more.

I want to thank the member for Simcoe West for reminding members of the House of the need to watch all expenditures very carefully, and to ensure that government is operating appropriately. He has a recollection of taxes from the previous government. I have been here for 16 years and I have a recollection of taxes from the Conservative government, including a proposed 37% increase by W. Darcy McKeough in the OHIP rates back when we used to have OHIP premiums, and a number of other taxes. So my memory does go back some many years.

To the member for Niagara Falls, I don't think we should ever assume that giving something to the senior level of government automatically makes it cheaper. I think the local municipalities have to resolve this. The club approach is a good one, in my view. If all the municipalities decide in Niagara that they want the region to take over the control of waste management, that might well be fine, but I warn you that it isn't necessarily the cheapest.

I want to note that the Premier has now entered the House. Having watched my debate, watched my speech in his office for the last hour and a half, he has felt that he should come in to respond and I appreciate his presence in the House.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate? I recognize the honourable member for Etobicoke West.

*Applause.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Thanks. Thanks.

**Interjection:** That was for being recognized.

**Mr Stockwell:** Okay, here you go. Thanks for coming.

I hate to disappoint the member for St Catharines, but the Premier heard that I was speaking next and that's why he came into the House, although he did watch your hour-and-a-half speech, I'm sure, as I did, and found it most interesting. Really, let's be frank, that probably kept Ontario on the edge of its seat, that respite there. I think he was both poignant on a lot of the debate and certainly articulate in expressing the views that concern his constituents in St Catharines, and I only hope that I can be equally as poignant representing the views of the people of the city of Etobicoke, or Etobicoke West specifically.

I'd like to start out discussing during interim supply, as a money bill, the issues that affect constituents today, and money's a big issue. This bill requires expenditures in the billions of dollars. In a lot of respects, the billions of dollars that we talk about today really lose their emphasis on the average taxpayer. When they fill out their taxes, they're probably talking of some thousands of dollars they're sending in to be spent by federal and provincial levels of government, so when we get to a debate where we're going to approve spending billions of dollars, it's really hard for people to fathom exactly how much \$1 billion is.

I remember once on Metropolitan Toronto council one of the members from North York, Mr Robert Yuill, at one time brought in cut-out money representing, I think it was, \$1 million and he stacked it on his desk. It was really quite astounding to see what \$1 million looked like. When you talk about interim supply and seeing that we're spending billions of dollars, you wonder if you broke it out into \$2 bills and spread it across the floor, it would go from one end to the next. When seeing the actual amount of money that one spends in this place, it really is somewhat astounding that we stand in our places in this place and debate expenditures in the billions and billions of dollars.

The Treasurer stood in his place and said, "This will allow us to pay our bills and pay our staff," and so on and so forth.

It still is of concern to me that governments, all governments—and I leave none out, all governments—have gotten to the point where spending money has lost any relationship to the amount that's being spent. In fact, during the budget items themselves, line items, they practically round off to the nearest \$100 million. It's rather astounding in my mind that when you do line item budgets in this place, you can round off to the nearest \$100 million. It would seem to me that when you round off to the nearest \$100 million, you've to some degree lost the emphasis for the amount of money that you're spending on behalf of the taxpayers.

Although it's difficult to express verbally, and it might be easier to express visually, we're talking about

a significant amount of money that we're spending on behalf of the taxpayers in the province of Ontario.

Why do I start with that? Well, I start with that because I think the vast majority of constituents in this province, and probably in this country, are very cynical about governments and politicians today. I talk about the cynicism out there in the constituencies I visit, because they don't believe that what governments say and do in opposition or on the campaign trail is quite exactly what they do once they've come to government.

1740

I will say this: Yesterday was a rather raucous debate and discussion in this place because the government itself moved two closure motions. Now, closure is a very interesting topic because what closure is really saying is that the opposition parties, the minorities, although they have people to speak on behalf of constituents, no longer have a right to speak in this place on an issue of the day that their constituents feel is very important. They don't because the government, to give them their favour, has decided that there's been enough debate on an issue or the points of debate are in fact repetitive or the opposition parties are just wasting legislative time. It's no doubt that that does happen. There's no doubt that happens, not just in this Parliament, not just in this sitting but in previous sittings before we were here and before any of the members sat in this place.

But it's very important for us to go back into Hansard and review what government members of the day said about closure when they were on this side of the House, because one's view of closure and time allocation appears to change dramatically depending on which side of the House you sit on.

I do have some Hansards here for the Premier, Robert K. Rae QC, from Mr Farnan—

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** List all the degrees.

**Mr Stockwell:** I don't have time. I would list all the degrees, but I only have an hour and a half. Mr Farnan, who's now the junior minister of one of the junior ministries; Mr Charlton, who happens to be the House leader and the very member who moved these closure motions—maybe not moved them, but in fact started the process to have other members move them.

Mr Charlton had some very interesting comments on closure when he sat on this side of the House, and I think it's really important not just for these members to know what they said when they were on this side of the House but for the Speaker himself to know, because the closure motions this government opposed in opposition appear to be very similar in circumstance to the closure motions they initiated themselves yesterday. I will say they did so in I believe a rather smug fashion, almost a majority smile creeping across their faces. That was only my personal view.

Mr Charlton had some interesting quotes that I would like read into the record in my time. Mr Farnan, again, was not just a one-time member who just haphazardly one day stood up at a debate on closure; he obviously gave this careful consideration, because he rose on a number of occasions to chastise the government of the day and the fact that it was moving closure on very important issues.

There was Mr Howard Hampton. Mr Howard Hampton in opposition had some very real problems with closure motions and the fact that they were usurping the democratic process and the democratic rights of those individuals duly elected as stewards of the taxpayers to represent their viewpoints on the important issues of the day.

Finally, probably I will save the best Hansard till last because the best seems to be Mr Cooke, who's the Minister of Education and Training now and had some very interesting points of view on closure and very interesting points of view on governments that said one thing when they were running for an election and did exactly the opposite once they were elected.

I know I bring this up on a number of occasions, but it's something—and I know I only have a couple of minutes till the vote—that sticks in the craw, I think, of this caucus, specifically me and probably the Liberals: the fact that during the last campaign in 1990, this government was led by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Rae, and the campaign was kicked off with an attack by the then opposition leader on Premier Peterson, and he called him a liar five times. Five times in the press gallery downstairs he called him a liar for insurance—

**Hon Allan Pilkey (Minister without Portfolio in Municipal Affairs):** Forget the past; you're living in the past. Live in the future.

**Mr Stockwell:** If the Premier would like it, I have a copy of that interview and I'll be happy to send it to him. But you did, Mr Premier, and you called him a liar on many issues that he felt Mr Peterson changed his mind on from when he was elected before the election in 1987 till 1990. That was the tenor of that election, and why it was set was because Mr Rae was making it very clear about Mr Peterson, that he said one thing when he was being elected and you did exactly the opposite when you got elected.

The member from Ottawa shakes her head. During this five-minute break when we have a vote, I'll go down and get that transcript and I'll read it into the record for the member from Ottawa, because that has set off, I think, a set of circumstances that will never change when elections come in the province any more. It's legitimized a type of election process that was the domain of the Americans, in my opinion, because they allow this kind of negative advertising to take place.



I bring this up because I bring up the cynicism that's out there from the public about politicians who say one thing and do another when elected. I think the Premier of the day during that election captured the hearts of the electorate because he spoke directly to that issue, the issue that politicians don't do what they say do once they're elected. He would say, "Let me be very clear and let me be very direct."

The cynicism has grown immeasurably in the last three years and I fear for the kinds of elections we will see in this province, because I don't think you'll ever see the Liberals run a campaign like they did last time. I'm not certain you'll see the Conservatives run the kind of campaign they ran last time. You set the tenor last campaign about flicking the channel converter and having distorted stories put on the news that things that didn't happen were in fact taking place. That's where the cynicism came from.

**The Speaker:** By order of the House, we have at 5:45 a deferred vote on government notice of motion number 5. Call in the members; a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1746 to 1751.*

#### MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

Deferred vote on government notice of motion number 5:

That, notwithstanding standing order 6(a)(i), the House shall continue to meet commencing Monday, June 28, 1993.

**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please rise one by one.

#### Ayes

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Bradley, Brown, Buchanan, Callahan, Carr, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Cousens, Curling, Dadamo, Daigeler, Duignan, Eves, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson (Don Mills), Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Jordan, Klopp, Kormos, Kwinter, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard;

Mackenzie, Mahoney, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock (Sudbury), North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Ruprecht, Silipo, Stockwell, Swarbrick, Tilson, Turnbull, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Wilson (Simcoe West), Winninger, Wiseman, Witmer, Wood, Ziembra.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one by one.

#### Nays

Sterling.

**The Speaker:** The ayes being 83 and the nays 1, I declare the motion carried.

#### INTERIM SUPPLY

Continuing consideration of government notice of motion number 7.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Etobicoke West may resume his speech.

**Mr Stockwell:** Is there not going to be a recount on that?

So, Mr Speaker, we have closure, and I would like to start off by reading from January 30, 1989, by Robert K. Rae QC, who voted opposed to the closure bill on Sunday shopping. He had some very interesting points when he was Leader of the Opposition that have changed dramatically, I can see, from when he changed sides of the House.

He said, "Mr Speaker, I want to speak very briefly in this debate." He seems to start all his speeches out like that, but they never seem to be brief.

"I have already indicated to you that I think this imposition of the guillotine is unjustified. It is unworthy of the democratic process that we would come to this in terms of the government using its majority to simply force through legislation without any significant change and without listening to the vast numbers of people who are strongly opposed to it.

"I also want to signal to you, sir, that we have fought this battle now for many, many months, indeed many years"—this is Robert K. Rae QC—

**Mr Bradley:** I'll be back.

**Mr Stockwell:** —speaking about closure and Sunday shopping, and my friend from St Catharines is going to do, I'm sure, very important constituency work and he will be back to listen.

Mr Rae went on to say: "and it has become perfectly clear to us that the government is bound and determined to have its way. To put it bluntly, we can add that we know the government, if this is what it is determined to do, can in fact force the House to vote and can, according to you and your ruling, sir, close off debate."

This is from the Premier of the province, whose government last night tried to move two closure motions within a mere couple of hours of each other.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** In the middle of the night.

**Mr Stockwell:** In the middle of the night. So that's closure and I think closure is an important issue, because what that talks about is cutting off the democratic rights of the people of the province of Ontario because there are some 60-odd members now, including the dissidents, representing millions of Ontarians who will not get an opportunity to speak on crucial issues like pay equity.

Mr Rae went on to say—and I'm putting this on the

record because the cynicism out there in the private sector and the public sector, in the taxpaying public, has now reached epic proportions and it has reached these epic proportions because they fundamentally do not trust politicians. They do not trust politicians because they don't tell the truth generally, Mr Speaker, and this probably is another example where truth wasn't close by.

Mr Robert K. Rae QC went on to say:

"They have had opportunities many times along the way to change their minds, to change the bill, to change the law, so that people would have more protection on Sunday than they have now. At each and every opportunity when they were presented with a chance to do something to change the legislation and to change the law, they decided not to do that."

This is kind of a double-edged sword for the Premier because he's not only talking about closure and his opposition to closure fundamentally, as a democratically elected servant of the public, but he's also talking about Sunday shopping. So here's a man whose courage of convictions runs so deep that he stands in this great place and he asks the government to reconsider its closure motion on Sunday shopping, yet as the leader of the government, he's in fact instituted broad, wide-ranging Sunday shopping and in one sitting last night moved closure twice.

Is it really any wonder why there's cynicism in the public today when a member on one side of the House can speak so eloquently about this issue, and on the other side of the House, absolutely forget everything he ever said about it?

1800

He goes on: "In closing, I want to say that in your ruling, sir, I think you have established a very dangerous precedent." I think that's what we were trying to say to the Speaker last night, because we felt that when they moved closure on the extension of the sitting hours, when he moved closure after merely two rounds of debate, some few hours of debate, there was a very important precedent being set. That precedent is that, accordingly, two rounds of debate can now move closure by the government, thereby shutting this House down and usurping any opportunity the opposition, the minority I might add, has to debate important issues of the day.

**The Speaker:** I don't mean to interrupt the member's speech, especially when he's in full flight. He will not lose any of his time.

My good colleague the member for S-D-G & East Grenville who normally occupies the chair at this time, on the final sitting day for the pages, established a practice a couple of years ago, at 6 o'clock, because now the pages do leave, of recognizing the pages, saying goodbye to them and wishing them well for the

summer. Perhaps they'll come back and visit us on occasion.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** We want another song.

**The Speaker:** I don't think they've got another song, but thank you very much.

I appreciate the indulgence of the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** I was really hoping that you would stand and yell, "Point of order," so I could ignore you, but since that wasn't the case—just a little bit of light-hearted humour there, Mr Speaker. Just a very bit, I might add.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** Did you get a grant to write that?

**Mr Stockwell:** It's funny you should say that. The member suggested did I get a grant to write that. I have notes here that I'm going to go to later on and in my notes is the CAW joke school. I would only ask that if you find this the least bit humorous, it's going to be a bit of a lighter bit, because I'm going to have some very intense stuff here, I think. But I think we could cool things out a little later on with the CAW joke school that's taking place probably as we speak.

I hear that when all the members got there, the standard line was, "Boy, I just flew into town and my arms are tired." That's the CAW joke school. They started their speeches out with, "Good evening, ladies and germs." Those union guys are funny people. They're a riot. There are no doubt, I'm sure, whoopee cushions and hand buzzers all over the place at that joke school. So I'm going to entertain that debate later on.

I'm not certain I can stop right now. I think to myself there would be a government grant of some \$30,000 given to union members to go to the CAW joke school. If it weren't so sad, it would be funny.

**Mr Hope:** —creative writing in the workplace for a lot of people who hadn't received an education.

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Chatham-Kent will have an opportunity perhaps later on.

**Mr Hope:** You've got a warped sense of humour.

**The Speaker:** Would the member for Chatham-Kent relax.

**Mr Stockwell:** It appears the member for Chatham-Kent is a little perplexed about the CAW joke school, to tell politically correct jokes.

**Mr Hope:** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: The CAW was one of the first ones to move on basic educational skills training, and it's unfortunate the member is making gruesome jokes about individuals who have—

**The Speaker:** The member for Chatham-Kent does not have a point of order, but the remarks he makes may be ones that he'd like to enter into the record when



he's recognized to participate in this debate. The member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** Apparently, the joke school touches a nerve, so maybe I can move to the song club that the unions started with government money, where they would write moving tributes to the union movement. They would put this pen to paper by, I'm sure, a cheap piano and start singing these songs in glorious—Sid Ryan, in fact, and the union people, I heard them. They're very good singers.

**Mr Mahoney:** I used to sing all the time.

**Mr Stockwell:** Clearly, \$30,000 to get a choir going and another \$30,000 to teach them how to tell politically correct jokes, it seems to me if this member wants to defend it—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I haven't even got to the meat of the discussion. I merely started about the CAW joke school and it's just turned these people into savages about not letting me finish my—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Now here they are again.

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I must tell the House that after 18 years of service to Bendix, when my sister was thrown out of a job, she went to such a school and they taught her how to cope with the emotional stress of not being able to provide for her family. For the member for Etobicoke West to make light of it and to somehow demean those people is profoundly offensive to me and to the people who were knocked out of jobs, and I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to remind him of that.

**The Speaker:** There is not anything out of order, but I understand the member's concern and I recognize the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** If we were talking about a program that was teaching people how to reapply for jobs, of course no one would make those comments, but that is not what we're talking about. Let's be very clear. What we're talking about is a school run by the unions to teach people how to tell politically correct jokes. That was reported in the media. That's the comments that were reported on. I can understand the angst if we're talking about teaching people how to reapply for jobs and so on and so forth, but that isn't it, and luckily enough, I have the press reports here:

"An Ontario government agency is forking out \$30,000 so 20 Canadian Auto Workers members can spend a week at a retreat discussing humour.

"The money will pay two humorists to prepare and present workshops on labour humour, and will help pay the travel expenses of CAW members who attend the August conference."

So let's get it straight here.

"The Ontario Arts Council made the grant under its artists in the workplace program. The jury that selected the proposal found it 'particularly appealing,' said the council's Naomi Lightbourn. 'The jury thought it was very refreshing. It's very positive.'

"The course, to be offered at the CAW's Family Education Centre in Port Elgin, will be 75% funded by the council. The CAW will pick up the rest of the tab, including travel costs for participants from outside Ontario."

So there's travel costs for participants outside of Ontario at the joke festival for the CAW.

"It's the first time the artists in the workplace program has funded a humour project....

"Bob Beneteau, the CAW member in Windsor who came up with the idea, said the workshop won't be a waste of money. 'Most of the things we have to deal with every day don't really lend themselves to stepping back and having a laugh.'

"He hopes participants will go back to their workplace or into schools and use their skills to make presentations.

"'A lot of good can come from it,' Mr Beneteau said. 'There's lots of working-class culture out there that no one's presenting.'

"The money goes to the humorists involved"—get this—"in this case Toronto-based Sheila Gostick and Mike Constable."

We're talking about money going to two comedians to teach CAW members how to tell politically correct jokes. So I don't want to hear the member for Middlesex any more.

Now I move—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Look, Mr Speaker, I can understand why they find it somewhat offensive, because that's embarrassing. That is somewhat embarrassing, to think during the social contract and a 5% rollback in wages, service cuts across this province, people aren't sure whether they're going to keep their jobs, layoffs predicted, you are giving 30,000 bucks to teach people how to tell jokes. That's unbelievable, and they can chant and demand all they want. That's the press release. That's the report. Read it. It's simple. It was in the Hamilton Spectator, June 23, 1993.

**Mr Hope:** They've done the programs.

**Mr Stockwell:** Apparently the member, Mr Hope, has passed the program or has done the program, and it's clear it doesn't work, so maybe we should rethink it on that approach.

**Mr Mahoney:** Chris, he's an instructor.

1810

**Mr Stockwell:** The member from Mississauga suggests he's an instructor.

I don't want to leave the public out there with the impression that what the member for Middlesex said has anything to do with this \$30,000. This has nothing to do with the \$30,000.

**Mr Hope:** Yes, it does. That's how closed your mind is.

**Mr Stockwell:** The \$30,000, I will repeat—

**Mr Hope:** I thought they only put mothballs in closets.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, now look. There you go. This is a good program. Mr Hope's working hard. He thought they only put mothballs in closets. Now, that's a \$10,000 joke, in my opinion. If he's got a couple more, we might get to \$30,000. Keep thinking, Randy. Holy smokes. The money's going to go to the humorists involved.

Why are they so touchy? I know why they're touchy.

**Mr Hope:** Because it deals with adult education. If it were a joke, I could deal with a joke.

**Mr Stockwell:** Here's Mr Hope again, jawing on about adult education. This is what the member won't get through his head. The money goes—

**Mr Hope:** Taking cheap shots at people who need help is a different story.

**The Speaker:** Order, member for Chatham-Kent.

**Mr Stockwell:** There it is. The money goes to the humorists involved, in this case: Toronto-based Sheila Gostick and Mike Constable." The money goes to two comedians to teach the CAW members how to tell jokes. I myself think this is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money. Clearly, Randy Hope doesn't, so there's a disagreement.

**Mr Mahoney:** Should have used the money to send them to Gananoque.

**Mr Stockwell:** They didn't want to go to Gananoque. They didn't want to go there, probably because they didn't think it was funny.

Mr Rae went on in the closure motion that this government tried, as I said, twice last night. I guess I should go right to Mr Charlton's speeches next on closure since he's here. He would probably remember those, and they were fine addresses, I must say. They were very eloquent, those statements that you made.

"In closing, I want to say that in your ruling, sir, I think you have established a very dangerous precedent," and I spoke about that. "I think it is a terrible precedent to say that the majority can in effect, without so much as a by-your-leave, amend the standing orders and simply force through legislation as it wishes....I think it is lamentable that we did not convince you that minorities need more protection in this House, and that is particularly true when they have a government the size of this one."

I think that's what we were saying yesterday. It's

very unnerving to know that minorities such as us don't have the kind of protection in this House that this government enjoyed when it was in opposition. "I think we are now living with rules and with precedents in this House which will not stand democracy well at the end of the day." This is Mr Rae: "It would be far better to have real consensus among all the parties as to how the business of the House should be ordered and some greater willingness on the part of the government to at least listen to those of us who are in opposition, to what it is we are trying to do." I think those are very good words that should be used to protect minorities in this House—

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture and Food):** Too bad you don't have any original lines.

**Mr Stockwell:** I didn't go to the joke schools, so I can't get my own original lines, but I may enrol just to see how it goes.

So those were Mr Rae's comments. I'll go to Mr Charlton's next, because he was a really interesting guy when it came to opposition and closure motions. You'd hardly think it was the same guy who sits over there at the left hand of the Premier and who made this speech in this House in opposition. So I will go directly to his since he's here. They always start out their speeches with—

**Mr Tilson:** "I want to be brief."

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, not so much—anger and frustration, he started his with. He had both anger and frustration. That was welling up inside him clearly, because, "I rise to speak on this government notice of motion with some anger and some frustration in my system—my political system I suppose it has become." I'm not sure what he meant there, but let's move on. "We have heard a number of my colleagues, specifically the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr D.S. Cooke) and the member for Nipissing (Mr Harris) last week, and some other members who have participated in this debate, read into the record a number of quotes from Hansard, many of them from the government House leader, some from the present Treasurer and some from the Premier himself during debates in 1982 and 1983 on the question of time allocation."

So you would note that the now House leader was standing on this side of the House on January 30, 1989, reading into the record some positions taken by previous governments on time allocation and how they, on this side of the House, were opposed to time allocation. So it seems really ironic that here we are today debating this motion, and I myself may stand and read into the record some of the comments made by then Mr Charlton, the now House leader, about his opposition to time allocation.

He says, "I find myself getting angry when I hear the government House leader saying that they have to move



time allocation so we can get on with other important business."

Lo and behold, he was getting angry when the House leader for the Liberals was saying, "We have to move time allocation so we can get on with other important business." That's exactly the comments that were coming from this side of the House yesterday, and I find it rather shocking and appalling, rather than frustrating and angering, that you, sir, could do exactly what you were trampling against some four years ago.

"He is trying to sell a crock to the people of Ontario. It is the government party, the majority party in this House, which orders the business of this House, not the opposition parties." That was Mr Charlton. Mr Charlton yesterday didn't seem to say these words. He used completely different words.

I think there should be a quorum to hear Mr Charlton's words, because there probably was when he originally said them.

**The Speaker:** Would the clerk at the table please count to determine if there's a quorum present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member may resume his remarks.

**Mr Stockwell:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Charlton went on—oh, and the member from—from where? I just want to get that straight because she had a very emotional moment there a minute ago.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** Middlesex.

**Mr Stockwell:** Middlesex—just came back and I just wanted to read her the press release—

**Mr Phillips:** London central, I think it is.

**Mr Stockwell:** Yes. Because it was rather emotional. I just want to be sure that she understands the joke school wasn't in fact what she thought it was.

**Mr Mahoney:** She's leaving now; you're driving her out.

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh, gosh. Well, she might be back in the next 60 minutes, and I'll keep that right there because I'd hate to think that she made that great speech and it was wasted; so I could just fill her in on what the joke school's all about.

So we move on to Mr Charlton. And the member for Scarborough Centre is back, good. I'm glad to see you're here.

Mr Charlton goes on to say—he gets himself angry; the crock of the government that orders the business—"The government party orders the business in this House, and the government of this province is at liberty to deal with any business it so wishes." You

know, that's interesting. They should have done that yesterday. "The government party in this House is not obliged to bring forward the two pieces of legislation which it knows the opposition is going to oppose in every way that it can until the other business it wishes to deal with has been completed. So let us not hear" any more of this from the government.

He says, "In this circumstance in 1989, having run through most of 1988 we have a situation where we have a piece of legislation which the vast majority of the public in Ontario opposes." Now, he's talking about Sunday shopping. So here's another conundrum. Here's this member opposite and he's a double-edged sword too. It's really ironic, don't you think, Mr Speaker? It's really ironic that here the House leader on this side of the House in a double-edged sword is opposing closure and opposing the introduction of Sunday shopping, and lo and behold, here he sits as House leader and he supports Sunday shopping and tries to move closure in the same sitting. You'd think it was almost hypocritical. Some would say that, I'm sure. I'm not being one of those, but some would say that that's rather a hypocritical thing to do.

He's talking about accountability and the legislation being imposed on municipalities. "We have a government that is supposed to be electorally accountable ignoring those whom it is supposed to be responsible to, and we have an opposition doing its best to bring some accountability to bear."

1820

There it is. This is all laid out. It's just awful. You think about it. It's awful that somebody can stand on this side of the House and make these kinds of grandiose statements, and get to the other side of the House and do exactly what they opposed with such anger and frustration. You've got to think that this would drive somebody out of the House if someone were reading Hansard into the record about them, and you know, it just did.

"I say to my friend that the local councils have no confidence in the government." He's saying the local councils have no confidence in the then previous administration. "They have told the government point-blank, clearly, that we do not want this legislation. The government is forcing it down their throats, treating them like babies and spoon-feeding them."

My goodness, what do you think of Bill 48, Mr Charlton? If you think the municipalities didn't like Sunday shopping and it was spoon-feeding, what are you doing with them on Bill 48? Geez, they don't like that bill any better than they did this.

He goes on and he says the word "joke," but it's not about anything humorous here. "Bill 114, which is also covered by this time allocation motion, is a joke. I have heard a number of members comment on this bill this afternoon. I am going to take a slightly different tack."

He thinks it's a joke to have time allocation. I ask the members opposite, how come none of you think that time allocation is a joke? Because your cabinet, en masse almost from previous Houses, thought it was a terrible thing to do, and they did it on stuff that had been debated for hours upon hours, second, third reading, a year, two years of debate and then they opposed time allocation. You know, it's unbelievable how different things have become.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** It was then. The whip, Fred Wilson, a member from down east, up east, says that was then and this is now, and that's really wearing out. I talked to some constituents out there and they hear you say, "That was then and this is now," but they're cynical now. They're real cynical. They think that you might have just said these things to get elected. I'm not so sure they're all wrong.

"Time allocation motions, which amount in the words of the government House leader to closure, are motions"—now here he says—"that should never be brought without very serious reserve on the part of the government that brings them. I am going to have to suggest that not only has this government not seriously considered the ramifications of using time allocation in a trivial situation like this one to force through bad legislation, legislation which ultimately is going to come back to haunt it, but that it certainly has not considered it as carefully as I give credit to its predecessor doing in 1982 and 1983."

He's saying this is bad legislation. We're moving closure and it's Sunday shopping. Now gosh, you people adopted Sunday shopping. You embraced it with a new vigour that's not been seen in this province, not just local option; it's just wide-open Sunday. I can't get over this. These words come back to haunt you, and I think it's important that we do a little haunting today.

And Mr Conway's defence that it was unproductive "to rethresh the straw" and the legislative days have stretched out and so on and of course, you didn't buy that.

Mr Robert K. Rae QC is clearly on the record and the House leader, Mr Charlton, is clearly on the record—and as I said about Mr Charlton, you were on the record. It was a double-edged sword: Sunday shopping and closure. And lo and behold, I just said, here you sit on that side of the House and you voted in favour of Sunday shopping and you tried to move closure twice last night. Pretty hard to believe how times have changed.

Your policies and principles and positions have changed so dramatically that you could stand here in this House and do things that you detested—no, he didn't just detest; caused him anger and frustration. He has certainly mellowed, this man; he must have mel-

lowed because he wasn't the least bit angry or frustrated last night.

**Mr Mahoney:** Some \$30,000 a year does that to you.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member from Mississauga points out that \$31,000 a year and a car does that to you. I don't like to think those things, but I think there are people who are thinking those things, and you'd better be very careful.

I have a lot of respect for Mr Farnan. I was glad to see him reappointed—he's not in cabinet, but I was glad to see him reappointed—to the junior minister of Education. He's still a step away from the cabinet table, but in no time I think he'll be back in the cabinet. I have a lot of respect for Mr Farnan.

**Mr Mahoney:** Did they educate him at joke school?

**Mr Stockwell:** No, he didn't go to joke school, I don't think. I'm still looking for the member for Middlesex. She hasn't come back. I'll just keep this joke school thing handy so I can straighten her out. I'd hate to think that rant was wasted, but apparently it was.

Mr Farnan, who was a very interesting guy when it came to opposition, was a really eloquent guy who spoke and walked with the people. He walked with the people on closure and on Sunday shopping and, lo and behold, again, here he's on the record, "The moment of truth has arrived," he started his speech. He was more of a statesman. You can see that he started out with a real point.

He wasn't frustrated or angry, he cut to the chase: "The moment of truth has arrived. The Liberal government's lack of accessibility will clearly demonstrate that what we have now is an arrogant and insensitive government, out of touch with the people of Ontario."

Now, he got that exercised about one closure motion on Sunday shopping. I'd hate to think if he were in opposition now. He got that upset over one closure motion on Sunday shopping. Now we know he's changed his vote; they moved closure twice yesterday. And that got him this upset. It's astounding. If he were on this side of the House, he would have exploded.

"Before examining the events that have surrounded the Sunday work legislation over the last several months, I invite the viewing audience"—he's speaking to the cameras—"I invite the people of Ontario and indeed I invite my honourable colleagues to cast their minds back to those lazy, hazy days of the summer of 1987. I would like to recall the image of open, accessible government that was presented to the people of Ontario."

You could almost just put in "those lazy, hazy days of 1990," when open and accessible and full of integrity and so on was presented to the people of the province of Ontario, when you people were opposed to closure and Sunday shopping and you were in favour of govern-



ment-run auto insurance and you wouldn't have reopened a collective agreement if they tried to cut your toes off.

I'll go on: "The people of Ontario will recall the member for London Centre"—he's speaking about the Premier, Mr Peterson—"mingling with the crowds, sleeves rolled up, tie undone, reaching out across the barriers, touching hands and listening." He's a good speaker, this guy.

"It was very much a Hollywood package, a package of an open, accessible candidate for Premier of the province presenting what he promised, an open and accessible government. Indeed, during his very first days there was a wonderful, symbolic gesture in which the Premier opened the doors of the Premier's office to allow the media to come in, to allow the public to come. Again, it was to project to the people of Ontario that indeed we were heralding the new era of open and accessible government."

You'd think that was the same thing that happened in 1990. This is Mr Farnan on this side of the House, not the junior minister today, the one who was opposed to closure and Sunday shopping. What else did he have to say? His is riddled with interesting quotes.

"The reality of the matter, my friends, is that there was no new era." He said, "The people of Ontario were deceived; they were taken in. First, they were taken in by a temporary openness forced on the government during minority government, an openness the New Democrats insisted upon. Second, they were taken in by the false sense of hope for greater openness, a major Liberal campaign theme given to the voters in September 1987. It is a theme that we can look back on now in the light of events that have surrounded the issue of Sunday work and say the people of Ontario were taken in."

I say that if Mr Peterson took them in, then in 1990, Mr Rae took them in the exact same way.

"As a new member," he goes on, "I was somewhat surprised. I thought there was some correlation between what a political party said when it was seeking election and what it would do after an election."

Can you imagine somebody of the NDP saying that in opposition? Can you believe it, after the flip-flops that have taken place on that side of the House, that they would have the audacity to criticize anyone for changing their minds after an election, and it was on closure and Sunday shopping? You know, this is just a frank, open damnation of this government, its 1990 campaign, everything they stood for in the three years since they've been elected. It's just a damnation.

Mr Farnan could just as easily, probably better, stand in this House today on this side of the House and make this speech about you and your record for the past three years.

He says, "It's a few short months and this government has forgotten where it stood on a lot of issues, Mr Speaker." He said that they "flip-flopped on the issue of open Sunday shopping, presenting a position that it did not have during the election."

It's unbelievable. Hansard's a great thing, isn't it? It's just riddled with these kinds of crazy quirks of how these people were in opposition, and the holier than thou, sanctimonious positions they took, and in government how you've just completely sold out. Closure's important. Do you know why closure's important? That's why it's dominating my talk today. Closure just cuts off any hope for real opposition.

1830

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** No, it cuts down on the rhetoric.

**Mr Stockwell:** It closes off on any hope—and the member from—

**Mr Abel:** Wentworth North.

**Mr Stockwell:** Abel, Mr Abel, I don't know his riding, he says it cuts down on the rhetoric, but that isn't what his leader was saying on this side of the House. That's not what he said about closure on Sunday shopping. You see, he was a different person on this side of the House, it seems to me, because Sunday shopping was something he valued and he didn't consider his opposition to Sunday shopping rhetoric, as I didn't consider it rhetoric. I think a lot of people out there didn't consider it rhetoric, but when you go to that side of the House and move closure on this side and vote in favour of Sunday shopping and you don't put in government-run auto insurance and take the flip-flops that you've done, don't give me this rhetoric debate.

**Mr Abel:** It's a matter of perception.

**Mr Stockwell:** It's a matter of perception. I'm not certain—the member, Mr Abel, says it's a matter of perception.

**Mr Abel:** Wentworth North.

**Mr Stockwell:** Wentworth North. I don't understand his matter of perception on Sunday shopping, I honestly don't. I classify that as an utter sellout, a complete flip-flop. That's what it appears to me. Those people who supported you on Sunday shopping think the same way. They think it's a sellout. Your position was etched in stone and then it changed dramatically. So don't tell me about rhetoric. It was clearly rhetoric to get yourself elected and that's the worst kind of rhetoric.

"It was bad enough that this legislation represented a broken promise." This is Mr Farnan again. "We all recall the Premier during the course of the election stating very clearly: 'We favour the recommendations of the select committee. We are in favour of a common pause day.' Yet remarkably he leads a government that is going to undermine a common pause day in Ontario and had to be forced to take the legislation out to the

people of Ontario. That is a remarkable transformation. As a new member, I had to sit here and wonder: Why did the Premier do this? Why did the Premier change his mind on this? Where did the ideas come from?"

That's an NDP member talking in opposition, the junior minister talking in opposition. I spread this out across the floor because the list is endless, absolutely endless, on the position this government took on closure, on Sunday shopping, on all these issues, and the disgraceful way they've abandoned these policies in government.

It's not surprising the people aren't listening to you any more. It's not surprising you get 8% of the vote in Don Mills and St George-St David. It's not surprising polls came back in those ridings and you didn't get a single vote. It really isn't surprising. They're cynical out there and you've created this cynicism; it has never run deeper, never. Has the cynicism in the general population ever run deeper? Because I think they were believing you. They felt you were the principled party in opposition which would carry forward on what you said in the election, and the cynicism has never run as deep because if there's ever been a measuring stick for broken promises, you have to be the new high-water mark. You haven't just broken your promises, you've absolutely assassinated them.

As I said, the list is endless, and I want to come to deal with some of the other issues that we're facing today. I could go on with Mr Farnan. He made a couple of great speeches here on closure and Sunday shopping and time allocation and those terrible, dastardly things that arrogant, self-centred governments move. I don't hear him saying that about his own government, but those are the kind of things he said. And I've got Mr Cooke on the record and Mr Hampton on the record and of course you heard from Robert K. Rae QC.

I'm looking back for the member for Middlesex. She's still not here. I'll have to update her on the joke school later.

I've got a few points I'd like to make on some of the other issues facing this province today. I want to talk quickly on one of them that I don't think is a huge issue out there to a lot of people but I find it offensive, and that's photo radar. Why do I find it offensive? I find it offensive for the same reason I find offensive seeing Metropolitan Toronto police sitting at the bottom of a hill in a school zone at 10:30 at night. I find that offensive because I don't really think they're governing the laws of the city or the province. I think they're there to create revenue for the government.

It's really not good revenue, because you go through a school zone at 40 kilometres an hour and if you're going 50 or 55 kilometres an hour, you'll find that you get a ticket, and you get a big ticket. I don't think somebody's speeding at 50 kilometres an hour or 55 kilometres an hour through a school zone at the bottom

of the hill, which is really a tough place to physically slow down in.

I get the same impression on this photo radar business. I get that same impression, because do you want to know where they set this photo radar, where the test project is? It's on Highway 403. There are many stretches on the 403 where the speed limit's 80 kilometres. You'd hardly know it was 80 kilometres, because it's a wide, open stretch of highway, just recently been built, a very, very, very good piece of road. I would bet a lot of people drive through there at speeds well in excess of 80 kilometres an hour. I think they drive through there probably at 100, 105, 110. You know what? I don't necessarily think they're driving badly. I don't think they think they're speeding in a lot of instances because the speed limit seems artificially low.

You ask yourself, "Why did they introduce photo radar?" I don't honestly believe it's to create a safer road. If they had wanted to create a safer road, they could have built better roads or fixed roads that are broken. That creates a lot of accidents as well. Put up stop signs and lights. That could stop a lot of unnecessary accidents and deaths. But this photo radar seems to me to be an end run, a back-door use to generate revenue, and they're doing it under the guise of protecting the public travelling in their cars.

I find it offensive because I think it's a process to generate revenue. The more people I talk to about it, the more offended they are, because if they truly wanted to make people safer drivers, they'd put the photo radar in place so you could identify the driver. If you could identify the driver and the driver knew that if he went speeding through here, he could personally get a ticket, then I think there could be some merit in it because people may slow down, because when you get a ticket, you lose points.

Some people are upset because of the money they spend. Others are upset because of the points, because if they get so many points, they lose their licence. But that isn't the case. They just take a picture of the licence plate and it doesn't matter who's driving that car, whether it's the husband, the wife, the kids, or you lent it to somebody: The car gets the ticket. The person who owns the car has to pay the ticket, and he may well not have been driving the car. You wonder, is this really put in place to protect the people in the province, or is it put in place to generate revenue? It's been put in place to generate revenue, in my opinion.

The other thing that frustrates me is that there's been an appeal out there by the car rental industry. They're really hammered about this, they're upset, and I speak from experience. They're very, very upset about this because when someone rents a car, they can now travel the province's highways at excessive speeds and not have any fear about getting a ticket or losing points,



because when that photo radar clicks that licence plate going by, the ticket will be sent to the rental company that owns the car. What is that doing? Is that providing safer highways? Is that scaring people to slow down? Not at all. It's just generating revenue, all under the guise of safety.

I wanted to comment on that because I think it's—

**Mr Abel:** You better not loan your car out.

**Mr Stockwell:** That's the point. The member from Wentworth says, "You better not loan your car." It's true: You better not loan your car.

The ones who are going to be impacted by this if photo radar goes through, I think, are the kids, the kids who have to get to school or get to their jobs and so on and so forth. The parents are going to think twice about giving them the car because you're going to get speeding tickets and you're not going to be responsible for them yourself.

I know that if you get one speeding ticket at 40 kilometres an hour over the speed limit in an 80-kilometre zone, \$120 isn't that unusual. You're talking about hundreds and hundreds of dollars. That's a lot of money. That isn't stopping one driver from speeding. That's not creating one safer road. That's just creating revenue for the province of Ontario. I find that a little concerning.

I went over the CAW joke school, and I get down to borrowing costs. I want to talk about the OMA first.

When this government was in opposition, the OMA, the Ontario Medical Association—let me just say this: The Ontario Medical Association, I think, has been very responsible in its approach to this government. I say that because every time this government has gone back to the OMA to review a contract, to renegotiate a contract, the Ontario Medical Association has agreed. I think they've gone back on a number of occasions, two or three times. They made several attempts to go back and review contracts.

I think the OMA deserves to have a quorum here, Mr Speaker, to hear its concerns registered.

1840

**The Speaker:** Will the Clerk count to determine if a quorum is present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member can resume his remarks.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to thank the member for Etobicoke West for calling that quorum. I think it's important that we have 20 members in the House to hear these issues.

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** Don't dislocate your shoulder patting yourself on the back.

**Mr Mahoney:** He went to the joke school.

**Mr Stockwell:** I went to the joke school. There's a bit of humour offered up.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Excuse me? The Minister of Agriculture is bellowing.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** You went to the library to get some Hansards.

**Mr Stockwell:** I went to the library to get some Hansards. This could be a very successful program, this joke school. They could enrol a series of ministers and members.

I want to talk about the OMA agreement, because of all the groups, the friends of this government were supposed to be the unions. The unions were the friends of this government, and I specifically speak about the public unions.

I think about the teachers. The teachers did a lot for you last election. They did a lot for you to try to get you elected. The Minister of Agriculture knows that, being an ex-teacher or probably on leave. Don't give up that leave either, Mr Minister. Being the minister on leave, he knows the work that teachers did. Mr Wiseman, the member for Durham West, being a teacher on leave himself, knows the work that teachers did to help you people get this kind of crazy majority of a 37% vote.

The thing about it is that the teachers and the public service employees, Sid Ryan and his group, Liz Barkley and her group and Fred Upshaw and his group, it's kind of funny to me how uncooperative they've been with you when it comes to negotiating this wage rollback—they haven't been cooperative—because these are the people you counted as friends. You counted these people as friends when you were in opposition and you were campaigning.

Yet the Ontario Medical Association, which you never counted as a friend, in fact you were polarized against it on a number of issues, not the least of which was user fees, has been the most cooperative group when it comes to your breaking agreements and not keeping your word when it comes to negotiated settlements. Here's a group that has come to the table on a number of occasions to review and renew contracts with the idea of rolling them back, and they've done so willingly. Well, maybe not willingly, but they've at least done so and come to the table and renegotiated contracts.

I'm not sure if it was the member for Beaches-Woodbine who was the Minister of Health at the time, I'm not certain, but I remember the fanfare there was announcing the seven-year doctors' agreement. I recall vividly in opposition saying that seven years will not stand. I don't know why the member for Scarborough Centre's applauding, because it didn't stand. You had to

go back and renegotiate. The doctors came to the table in the spirit of goodwill and negotiations. They in fact came back to renegotiate their deal and they did so without so—well, not much, anyway—public muttering.

I see the member leaving, but it's a true statement, whereas the Sid Ryans and Liz Barkleys and Fred Upshaws, your friends before the election, have done nothing but drag their feet and tear down every attempt you've ever made to do the same thing with them. I find that kind of shocking, and you know what it says to me? It gives me a greater sense of duty that the Ontario Medical Association has.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** Does that bother you?

**Mr Stockwell:** No, I think it's good on their part. I think it's proven their mettle, and you know what it's proven to me is that they have a true sense of social conscience. They understand the dilemma that you've put yourselves in. They understand that you couldn't live up to the agreement which you so foolhardily signed in the first place, and they've come back to the table and said, "Yes, we fleeced you, we took advantage of you, and maybe you were not very bright in those first few months, but we're going to be happy to renegotiate it with the idea of renegotiating it down." I think that's a comment on the OMA and I think they deserve a pat on the back for that.

I only wish the Sid Ryans and Liz Barkleys and Fred Upshaws of the world had as much of a social conscience and as much responsibility as the Ontario Medical Association has, because they also received substantial increases over the past three years and they've done nothing but cause you headache after headache on these social contract negotiations and all you've done is to go out of your way to try and approve a deal that probably won't save a lot of money but may protect some jobs. So I'm sincerely disappointed in that crowd.

I did read in the paper that Sid Ryan doesn't think the Conservative Party—Sid Ryan says that we're not a friend of the worker. Now that really discourages me. Sid Ryan thinks that we're not a friend of the worker. I guess he doesn't think you're a friend of the worker either, because he was saying that in the context that we voted in favour of Bill 48. So the only friend of the worker in the province of Ontario is the Liberal Party. I note Mr Mahoney is here. The only member in this House whom Sid Ryan considers to be a friend of the worker would be Steve Mahoney right now, the member from Mississauga.

But isn't that a terrible thought, that a government trying to institute a program of cost savings would be tarnished like that by a head of a union, not to be a friend of the worker because you're trying to save money for the benefit of the taxpayers? It discourages me that Sid Ryan would say that. It discourages me that Fred Upshaw would take the hard-line position.

It discourages me that Liz Barkley—and I'll say this carefully: teachers. Probably a group of people who could afford to take, if any group could afford to take a cut as well as the OMA, it would be teachers. It seems to me that their pay packets are fairly good, their pension plans are second to none, and if anyone could suffer a 5% rollback and feel it as little as anyone, it would be teachers. So I'm discouraged that Liz Barkley has taken this hard line, and, you know, it's out of touch and out of step with the constituents out there. It's out of step with what the people of this province are thinking today.

I was knocking on doors a couple of weeks ago in my riding. We were knocking on doors to try to get a local school opened by the school board. I was in what I would consider to be an upper-middle-class neighbourhood, people who I think were reasonably secure and reasonably wealthy. As I went through there knocking on doors to try and get an average number of children in the area so we could determine whether or not we could open our school, it astounded me to find that in my three or four streets I did there were two houses that I came to that had notices of foreclosure on them.

I always thought this neighbourhood was a rather stable, upper-income neighbourhood, and it was rather scary for me to think that, before this, a family lived there and a family was raising their children and now when I came to the door I just saw one of those sheriff's postings that said this house, according to some bank or trust company, has been foreclosed on.

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** Damn banks.

**Mr Stockwell:** Damn banks, the member says, and sometimes I agree with you. There are some damn banks out there.

But, you know, it was really discouraging for me to see that, because I think to myself of the kids who lived there and the families that were living there and the difficulty that now they are probably faced with upon being foreclosed on. I mean, who knows where they went to live? Who knows what they were doing at this time? Their house wasn't their home any more. It was something that caused me a lot of thought that night when I went home, and it's something that really has bothered me since.

The recession and this terrible time we're going through, we often hear about the homeless and the food programs and all those things that get a lot of profile because they have a lot of proponents speaking about them. But you don't get a lot of people talking about the houses that have been foreclosed on and the families that have left their homes and neighbourhoods, and the children who got pulled out of their schools and don't go to their same schools any more. They're just a family. There's nobody speaking on their behalf. There are no loud demonstrations down here. It's just a quiet



evolution that's closing down the areas and neighbourhoods that I know in Metropolitan Toronto.

1850

I just think to myself that we often give a lot of thought to the food programs and to the homeless, and so it should be, but it's not often anyone comes in here and talks about, "Joe Blow around the corner from my house got foreclosed on last week, his children who used to go to school up the street don't go to school there any more and he moved in someplace with a family friend."

That, to me, was a very worrisome thing. It has bothered me quite a bit actually, because, as I said before, these kinds of things don't get a lot of public profile. The strength of our neighbourhoods is the people who live in them. I don't think there's anything that hit home quite to me as hard: There but for the grace of God go I, which is all of us, if we lost our jobs. Nothing has hit home quite as hard as going around that day to those four or five streets and finding those homes that were foreclosed on.

I've talked about the OMA agreements and photo radar and the CAW joke school. I want to talk about the crown corporations that you've set up. I'm not a believer in borrowing money by governments, because I don't think the governments have the ability to pay it back. That's my belief. I think to myself that politicians are generally human by nature, and "human by nature" means that if you can put off till tomorrow a decision that is an unpleasant one, you will do that.

**Mr Paul Johnson:** Procrastinate.

**Mr Stockwell:** They procrastinate, yes. I don't trust any government of any party. If I were in a party that was in government, the first thing I would do is vote for a balanced budget motion.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** You would ask for a recount.

**Mr Stockwell:** I did go through a recount once, the member suggests.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No, if you won government, you would ask for a recount.

**Mr Stockwell:** No, I wouldn't. I don't think I'd ask for a recount. Although did you hear the CAW joke school? I would like to send an application to the Minister of Environment and Energy, because the joke school may work.

But why I would ask for a balanced budget is because I don't think you or the Liberals or we are capable of borrowing money and paying it back. I don't think we are because we procrastinate and we put off tough decisions and we have a tough time saying no, and borrowing money is a lot easier than telling a bunch of people, "No, I don't have enough money."

I don't like borrowing money. I think the municipalities are only in as good a shape as they are today,

which is significantly better than you and significantly better than the federal government, because they never could borrow. They never had the legislation that allowed them to borrow. If they couldn't borrow, they made tough decisions. We used to make tough decisions every year at council when it came to budget time, because we couldn't say, "Yes, give everybody money and we'll go and borrow it and pay it back next year," which of course is what provincial and federal governments did.

When we talk about crown corporations, it concerns me that now you've moved another little trick in your bag of financial wizardry. You've set up a bunch of crown corporations to process some of your debt off on.

I think there should be a quorum to hear this, Mr Speaker, because I think it's important.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Etobicoke West can continue.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm bringing this crowd in here for quorum, because I think it's important to talk about the crown corporations you've set up. I forget it's name, but I call it the jiggery-pokery act, these crown corporations you've set up to move some debt off your books on to their books.

Why does that bother me? It bothers me for a couple of reasons. The only times you've allowed other corporations to go out—I don't mean you specifically; I mean governments—to borrow, they've got themselves in a hell of a mess. I think of Hydro. They have borrowed themselves silly. Mr Maurice Strong is up there now trying to rein in that operation, and that is a tough job. I give Mr Strong full marks. Have you noticed? As Energy critic for my party, I've not asked a question in this Legislature because I think Mr Strong is doing a bang-up job. I'll say that publicly; I'll say it here. He is doing a bang-up job with a very difficult situation.

But why is he in a difficult situation? One of the reasons is that Marc Eliesen and previous people who have been in that position have allowed that operation—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Wildman:** There was a fellow named Franklin as I recall.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm not suggesting for a moment that it's just his fault, but previous chairmen and previous operators of that facility have made some very crucial errors in judgement, and when you make crucial errors in judgement in business, it only does one thing: It costs you a lot of money. This facility is in serious debt crisis. So we speak of that one.

What's another one that can go out there and, to a degree borrow, differently but borrow? WCB. I know the Minister of Labour knows all about WCB. WCB has an unfunded liability that literally changes monthly, it's going up so quick. Is it \$12 billion now? I don't think that's unreasonable. A \$12-billion unfunded liability. That's another government agency that was given quasi-capacity to borrow.

So we think of Hydro, we think of WCB, and we think of us.

**Mr Abel:** Forget about lights, forget about the injured workers.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member from Wentworth says forget about the injured workers, forget about lights. I'm not arguing with you that those things are important things, but that isn't the issue. They won't be important in the next generation if we can't afford to fund them.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** They're not important to you, though, Chris.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Yorkview says they're not important to me. They are important to me. Don't think you've cornered the market on compassion. Just because I attack an issue from a different angle doesn't mean it's not important to me, and only to you. I think it's important because I want to get its fiscal house in order; otherwise, it won't exist. Don't you see?

**Mr Mammoliti:** You said you don't want anything to do with workers' compensation; that's what you said.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Mammoliti:** That tells me that you don't care.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member isn't even in his seat.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The honourable member for Yorkview will come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm just attacking it from a different angle, because if this isn't rectified quickly, they won't exist. WCB won't exist. You can't keep going into debt without one day having to pay the piper. We think of three organizations that are either given the authority to borrow or a quasi ability to borrow, and they're all in debt up to their eyeballs.

On principle alone, on that basic principle, I will not support the crown corporation deal you're starting. That's the idea that we strike three or four different agencies that have the capacity to go out and borrow and build roads or build sewers or create clean water. I know what will happen, as sure as we're standing here today: In 10 or 15 years they're going to be in big-time debt. It's a natural evolution of any government agency, because the bottom line is that nobody owns it and nobody's there day to day to ensure their dollars are being spent wisely. That to me is a scary thing, because as these things gear up, these three corporations, you will discover that we're going to be further and further in debt because they have the capacity to borrow.

That's just a fundamental disagreement I have with you people, and I honestly thought you held that opinion. I'm not quoting NDP policy chapter and verse, but as I recall, in the water-sewage deal that the Liberals were putting forward, you were opposed, opposed fundamentally, because of the reporting structure and so on and so forth. It seems to me that you've done primarily the same thing here.

**1900**

I know why you've done it; it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out why you've done it. You've done it because you want to keep that deficit figure under \$10 billion: this year you moved \$800 million off book, next year I think it's \$1.7 billion, and the year after it's something like \$2.6 billion. I can understand why you're doing it, because it's a way of moving that deficit off book and getting your deficit numbers down a little. You'll say, "We're doing a good job," but you ignore those crown corp deficits. I don't find that very honest. I think that's a big reason.

The other reason I think you're doing it is that come 1995, when the election's called, you're going to want to look like good fiscal managers. You've screwed up any credibility you had in the first couple of years, I think, with your billions in borrowing and your spending and so on. There's not many people out there who would classify you as good fiscal managers. But I think you think that by moving these corporations off book, you're not only going to move your deficit off book; I think you think you're going to move employees off book. You're still going to have those employees and you're still going to be responsible for their payroll and you're still going to have to guarantee their borrowing, but when it comes down to the basic public sector, you're going to exclude them. Come 1995, they're going to say, "How many employees do you have?" and you're going to say, "We have  $x$  minus what those people had, so we have  $y$ , and we've cut employees by this much," but they'll only be in these crown corporations. I think that's, to a degree, a machiavellian plan you've devised.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet and Government House Leader):** Read the bill some time.

**Mr Stockwell:** I did read the bill, and that's what I think you're going to do. I think you're going to do that because that's why you set up these corporations. I don't understand why you'd set them up otherwise. Anything these things can do, anything this group can do, you could have done internally. There's nothing they do that you couldn't have done internally. If I can stand to be corrected, I look forward to that, but I've checked it and there's nothing they could do that you couldn't do internally. If you wanted to lend money the way you're going to lend it out and then pay it off over 20 years and so on, you could do that internally with



the boards of education and so on. If you wanted to create a balanced building process between the private sector and government, you could do that internally. There's nothing to say that you have to create one of these quasi-corporations.

I don't know why you did it unless those were the big, compelling reasons. It seems to me that you're so fixated on your deficit—which I don't think is wrong—that this was a compelling reason. But I don't believe for a moment that there's some kind of long-range plan taking place that will in fact deal with that. That bothers me. Those crown corporations really, really bother me.

I know what's going to happen. In five or six years they're going to have huge debts and when we get into power we're going to have to deal with those debts, just like in Bill 48, where there's going to be a pile of deferred payments for payroll there and we're going to have to deal with that. It really is concerning, because here we'll be in government and we'll have all these bills we're going to have to pay.

I want to talk briefly in my closing portion about one of the things I think you've done, one of the programs you took over. I'm glad the Minister of Environment and Energy, Mr Wildman, is here today, because if there's one process you have thoroughly messed up, one process you've absolutely botched from the word go, it was the landfill issue, the dumps. Now, I've known the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore for a number of years, and I know her position on landfill issues.

I think there should be a quorum to hear this, too, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to thank myself again for calling that quorum, because I think it's important to have a quorum here.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Are you refreshed? You look refreshed.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Yorkview is asking if I'm refreshed. Thank you for your concern, sir. Yes, I'm refreshed. The member for Yorkview should note that if he's not busy in the latter part of this month, there's a joke school taking place. Sheila Gostick and Mike Constable will be giving a joke conference in August. It might be of interest for you to go. You may enjoy it. It may help your political career, you never know.

Why do I want to talk about the IWA? The Minister

of Environment's here, so I'm glad. If there's one issue you have thoroughly messed up, screwed up from the word go, it's this one. Probably it's had as much exposure as your financial crisis and mismanagement, but probably more so in the greater Toronto area than outside.

Being on Metropolitan Toronto council during the period when we were searching for a long-term landfill site, we took this job very seriously and went to great lengths to accommodate the provincial government in its hope of finding a willing host.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Spent millions.

**Mr Stockwell:** Literally millions. We spent millions and millions of dollars to try to be a fair and reasonable owner of a landfill site in the province of Ontario.

I think a quorum should be here to hear this too, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the table to ascertain if there is indeed a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Acting Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The honourable member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** I think back to the time we were discussing the IWA. We had a couple of commissioners of works, Mr Frank Horgan and Mr Bob Ferguson—Mr Horgan is the member from Simcoe's uncle—and they were extremely good at their jobs. We spent a lot of time trying to find a long-term landfill site.

During that process, we had a number of public hearings in neighbourhoods and areas and parts of this province that did not want a landfill site. This government got elected and immediately stopped any process that was taking place. It seems to me that what they have done in the past three years is absolutely nothing. They've been spinning their wheels, and all they've done is to upset practically every community surrounding the greater Toronto area.

I couldn't have asked for a better political tool than what the Minister of the Environment then, Ruth Grier, did. She succeeded in upsetting 57 communities around the greater Toronto area. She upset them because she created this mythical, hopeless process to find a landfill site, when we knew full well, having gone through the process for three or four years, that in the greater Toronto area there are only four or five legitimate sites. We in this party said, "Why waste another three years doing what we've already spent the last four years doing?"

1910

After three years of public input, I say to the Minister of Environment, after three years of wasted tax dollars, of upsetting community after community out there, what

does your report say? Your report says we should go to these three, four or five communities for a landfill site, and they're the very same communities that we had picked three years ago, that we told you were the only acceptable sites. I think of the \$30 million you've spent on this process to establish what was already established. It was such a waste of money.

I'm going to start crystal-ball-gazing on this issue. I think this Minister of Environment—

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Is the best we've ever had.

**Mr Stockwell:** —is the best this government has ever had. I think this Minister of Environment, upon announcing the final three sites, is going to also do one other thing. I'm saying this long in advance of what—I just get this sense, I get this feeling, I get this certainty taking place. Any time I've had a call on this government, I've got to admit, I've been pretty close. I think he's going to say he's going to allow an environmental assessment hearing on Kirkland Lake.

I look at Mr Wildman. I don't want him talking to the member from Kingston. I want him to listen to this prognostication. Mr Wildman, I think that you are going on the announcement to call for an environmental hearing process on Kirkland Lake. I think that's going to happen. I think that because it seems to me, and I'll be clear about this, that everything you've done in the past three years has led you to finally deciding that what Metro was doing four or five years previous to your being elected was a worthwhile exercise, because the only conclusions you've come to are the exact same conclusions it came to.

Furthermore, you're also going to find out that poor Mr Wiseman is going to bail out big time, that Mr O'Connor is going to have real difficulty, that Mr Drummond White and my friend Gordon Mills are going to have some real, real concerns with the announcement that you make, so by announcing an environmental process on Kirkland Lake, it's going to, you think, get them off the hook. The only problem is that it won't get them off the hook enough to win the next election. But it may turn some people who aren't quite as mad as the majority of the people in their ridings.

That is what I think will happen. I want the Minister of Environment, maybe in the two-minute questions and answers, and again he's talking to the member from Kingston, to get up in the questions and answers and put that terrible rumour to rest that is out there, that on announcing the final dump sites, you are in fact going to call for a full environmental hearing review on the Kirkland Lake site. If you could put that rumour to rest, you'd probably create more unrest out there in the greater Toronto area, but I think you should do that.

In summing up, I've touched on quite a few issues.

I've touched on Hansard's ability to come back and bite members in government from when they were in opposition. I've talked about photo radar, which is something that bothers me. I'm glad I got it on the record, because it's been really ticking me off. I think it's just a revenue generator. I've talked about the CAW joke school.

It's a shame. In my whole address, an hour and a half, the member for Middlesex, who got really upset, still didn't come back so I could read her the press release that was released by the CAW. It says clearly and categorically in here—I don't know about her sister and what course she's in, but it's clearly not this course, because this course, the CAW joke school, for \$30,000 of government money, is hiring two comedians, Sheila Gostick and Michael Constable to hold a joke forum at the CAW retreat in August in Port Elgin. That, to me, is not anything the member for Middlesex is talking about. I get the impression that she doesn't want to hear this. I think she's staying out of this House on purpose until I sit down so she won't be embarrassed by hearing this. I know that's imputing motive, but after an hour and a half, you have to wonder, maybe this member is avoiding this place.

**Mr Owens:** Where are the rest of your colleagues?

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Scarborough Centre pipes up. I say to you, sir, if you get any more comfortable, you may well fall asleep.

**Mr Owens:** What's Mikey hiding from?

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Scarborough Centre is heckling me in his usual fashion. I don't know where he is, but if you really want to know, I'll find out for you. I don't know what you're doing there, but I wonder if it hurt.

I touched on the CAW joke school, Bill 48, my concerns about Bill 48. I'm a believer in the bang, bang, bang scenario: 5% across the board for everybody, roll it back. I talked about borrowing costs and the crown corporations. The Ontario Medical Association: That's an important issue to me. I talked about the crown corporations and the fact that they're going to be allowed to borrow, and the lack of progress in this place.

I didn't get a chance to get around to the conservation authorities, but it seems to me that a government that is so intent on planning and the planning process, and the zoning and development of areas—the member for Scarborough Centre waves his hand in entire delight, but I think you've got a lot to answer for. On local councils, your representatives in the New Democratic Party, one of whom was the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, held very, very firm convictions about conservation authorities and their ability to deem land to be public.

Do you realize the crisis you're putting this conserva-



tion authority in today by taking all this very rare and public open space that we create parkland with and forcing these conservation authorities to put this property on the chopping block, to be sold off to the highest bidder, which no doubt will be none other than a developer? All this public open space, this parkland, will become developable.

I find that offensive. I find it offensive for a government that believed in parkland, in zoning, in public open space, in densities and the planning process to in one fell swoop create more lousy development in parks than any government in the history of this province.

The last thing I want to do is that I want to go on the record for the poor people of Etobicoke-Lakeshore, because there's an issue out there that I think the member has not spoken to very well. The issue is the development of psychiatric grounds. It's a personal, local issue that I dealt with when I was on council. This member, when the Conservatives closed down the psychiatric hospital, was absolutely apoplectic. She suggested that all they were doing was opening the doors and letting the patients walk the streets of Toronto.

So I am myself absolutely astounded that a short week or so ago, the same member who chastised a Conservative government in the late 1970s and early 1980s for the closing of the Etobicoke-Lakeshore psychiatric grounds would in fact be doing the very same thing. No shaking your head, Scarborough Centre. Them's the facts. You can look them up.

That, to me, is an offensive abuse. It's an offensive abuse because this is not the area we should be cutting back on even in the coldest days in this province. I think the people of Lakeshore, in the city of Etobicoke, in Mimico, in New Toronto, in Long Branch, have been fighting the fight for no development on the Etobicoke-Lakeshore psychiatric grounds and the Humber College properties and they haven't had any cooperation from their local member of provincial Parliament.

#### *Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** No. No cooperation. The dogma that's in place is that those lands are being developed over the objection of practically every resident in the Lakeshore community. Why is that? It's because the dogma about social housing ruining public open space at the shoreline of Lake Ontario is absolutely the most insane use of public property.

I, as a member of Etobicoke council, never supported development on this site. I can't believe that it's taking place under this government. I say to the members opposite, please investigate this. It's prime, public open space on Lake Ontario. You can't get that back. You can't get that kind of property back. Once you've build on it, it's gone. The open public space in Etobicoke, the lake, is infinitesimal. This is the last chance we have for

the jewel in the city of Etobicoke, the jewel, the park by the lake, to save it from the developers' ball, the wrecking ball, in the development of the Humber College site and the Lakeshore psychiatric grounds.

#### **1920**

This is not a local issue in Etobicoke West, but it's very dear to my heart, having spent some nine or so years representing the good people in the community of the lakeshore and the city of Etobicoke who fought long and hard to ensure that this kind of development wouldn't happen, and the ruining of public open space on the lakefront in Etobicoke would never take place, without any cooperation from their duly elected member of Parliament, the Minister of Health.

In closing, I wanted to bring that up, because those are the kinds of issues that this government has forgotten about. Those are the kinds of local issues that you've sold out on. Those are the kinds of planks that I agreed with you on. I agreed with you on the planning process. I agreed with you when it came to conservation authorities. I agreed with you when it came to zoning requirements. I agreed with all those things, and now, in one fell swoop, you're wiping out public space in the conservation authority; you're building on property fronting Lake Ontario and Etobicoke; you're selling out on all kinds of planks that you believed in in the past.

That leaves me not only breathless but discouraged, because there's a cynicism out there, and a cynicism that has been embellished and in fact helped out by this government and its lack of integrity and commitment to the positions and decisions that it took in opposition.

I opened this up with your positions on Sunday shopping and closure in Hansard. I think all you members should take some time to go back to those debates and read them and remember what it was like to be a minority in this place. It was frustrating and difficult. Then you'll understand why I stood here today talking about the differences between you now and then, and the frustration and anger and bitterness that is building up, not only on this side of the House but in the public in the province of Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments? The honourable member for Mississauga West.

**Mr Mahoney:** Did the minister wish to go?

**The Acting Speaker:** I see the honourable member for Algoma.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Just one brief response to one portion of the member's remarks, and that regarded the possibility of an environmental assessment with regard to a particular site in the province.

I just want to reiterate what I've said a number of times in this House, that any proponent who wishes to bring forward a proposal for environmental assessment for a landfill site anywhere in the province is quite within his or her rights to do so, and of course the

Environmental Assessment Board would evaluate the site on the basis of environmental factors, socio and economic factors as well, and of course government policy and Bill 143.

**Mr Mahoney:** I'm responding to the member for Etobicoke West, but I couldn't help but hear the minister suggest that anybody could bring any particular proposal forward for an evaluation of an environmental assessment. There's been a request from a group from Kirkland Lake for some time to have an environmental assessment.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** They can go ahead if they'd like.

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, they'd like you to—

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No, I'm not going to make them.

**Mr Mahoney:** No, okay, I understand, "You can go ahead and organize your own environmental assessment, but we, the government responsible for waste management issues in this province, don't want to be involved in it." I'm sorry, I didn't understand the difference.

Let me address the member for Etobicoke West. First of all, let me congratulate the member for Etobicoke West for giving the first speech by a member of the Conservative caucus that I've heard in this session where he didn't mention the former Liberal government. I want to tell you that either you're slipping or you've forgotten. I'm not quite sure what the problem is. Maybe he's mellowing.

We heard him talk with some passion about the lakefront in great city of Etobicoke. I grew up in Etobicoke. I don't know if you know that, but I spent a lot of time there. I'm delighted. There were some members opposite, when you said it was close to your heart, who said they didn't know you had one, so I think you've really sort of set a new tone for the Chris Stockwell fan club in this place, and I want to congratulate you for doing that.

I enjoyed the speech. I thought that even though you drove the member for Middlesex out—I think she's gone to a class, actually. You drove her out of this place because she got rather passionate about the people who were involved in the joke school. Even though you did that, even though you may have ruffled some feathers and upset some people, I think you talked in this debate about the things that are not only important to your constituents in Etobicoke West but also to the people of this province. I look forward to continuing this debate as well.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I'm pleased to rise and commend and thank my colleague the member for Etobicoke West for his eloquent remarks this morning. I say to the member for Mississauga West that although Mr Stockwell may have not mentioned the previous Liberal government too many times in his remarks, you can rest

assured that Mr Stockwell had many more opportunities to inform the public and remind them of the Liberals' record in office between 1985 and 1990.

But I do want to say most directly to members of the Legislature that having Mr Stockwell in the Ontario PC caucus is indeed an honour and a pleasure. He comes to our caucus with many, many years of experience for such a young man and he brings a wealth of knowledge to our caucus and to this Parliament. When he speaks on issues, he doesn't do that frivolously or without background. He does it with a great deal of knowledge and he knows of what he speaks.

He spoke about the conservation authorities and I wanted to take a moment to comment on that section of his remarks because it is one of the most ironic things, I think, for me as a member of the Legislature—and I'm also an honorary member of the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority foundation—that in the last election, during the all-candidates meetings, neither the Liberal nor the PC candidate could possibly out-green the NDP candidate. They had a corner on compassion, they had a corner on the environment and no matter what you said, it wasn't good enough. To see that party and this government now cutting conservation authorities in such an unrealistic manner is beyond belief to me, and I'm being polite, because the conservation authorities' association has come forward with a very sensible plan to save money and the government's rejected that. I find that ironic and I take this opportunity to plead with the government to listen to the conservation authority association and to work with them and bring a meaningful response to this issue.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Just a comment to the member for Etobicoke West: Listen to your constituents. Listen to other constituents before you stand up and go on for an hour and a half and do nothing but criticize. I think if I were to go back into Hansard for the last three years, any of your speeches would certainly be critical, critical of everything. I don't think there's one positive thing that has come out of your mouth in this place.

One bit of advice I'd like to give you is, be a little positive in life. Look at life and say, "Thank God I'm here," and I guarantee you'll feel a lot better and you'll come across a lot better in this place as well. If you do that, Mr Stockwell, you will feel better. If you do that, believe it or not, you might even hear the cries out there. And if you do that, you will know that almost everything this government is doing, it's doing because there's a cry out there for it. They're doing it because people are saying: "Jobs, we want jobs. We want government to create jobs." That's why we're doing most of the things that you're criticizing.

You talk about Hydro. Mr Fiscal Manager, you talk about Hydro. Who introduced Hydro? Who, Mr Fiscal Manager, is the one and what party is the one that couldn't handle it? You—and the Liberals, for crying



out loud; the Liberals ignored the deficit and you neglected to mention that in your speech. For that reason, I'm being negative towards you right now. I'm saying to you, listen to your constituents. Listen to the people of Ontario and I don't think you'd be as negative as you were today.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Etobicoke West has two minutes to make a response.  
1930

**Mr Stockwell:** Thank you to the member for Mississauga West. You have to know the difference between having a heart and wearing your heart on your sleeve. I think that's the difference that I've come to learn about politicians. They wipe their noses on it, and that's the difference.

I'd like to say thank you to the member from Simcoe West, Mr Horgan's nephew. He gave, I think, a good dissertation, and I'll probably frame it and send it out in my next householder, although I don't do householders.

The Minister of Environment was talking about not giving an environmental assessment hearing. I don't know if I believe that. I think there's something cooking over there and I just want to give all those people in the GTA some knowledge, in Durham and in York and in Peel. I think he's got something cooking and it could be percolating in the next few months.

To the member for Yorkview, the guy is just way too negative. He's always standing up and being too negative. I think what he should do is accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative, because I myself in my speech just moments ago said what a great job Maurice Strong was doing. I said it; I was here. I spent five minutes on saying what a fantastic job he was doing. I supported everything he did and I think that he was probably paid appropriately.

So I just think the member for Yorkview should take a little time in August and just reduce some of those negative ions. I think he should go up to Port Elgin and enrol in the joke school that the CAW is offering and just take it easy, tell us that he's tired, he just got into town—boy, he's tired—and, "It hurts when I go like this, doctor," so the doctor says, "Don't go like this." Just lighten up, George.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? The honourable member for Mississauga West.

**Mr Mahoney:** The former speaker said there's a difference between having a heart and wearing it on your sleeve. It reminded me of Johnny Barker. I see the Minister of Labour. I don't know if you ever knew Johnny Barker up in the Sault, a great trade union man and a real fighter. Bud, you would remember Johnny, a great friend of my dad's. He always used to say very clearly, I think, something that made sense, in the same vein, where he said, "Don't let your bleeding heart run away with your bloody head." Clearly that was a

message that Johnny Barker and many of the folks in the local in the Sault and around the labour movement in the 1950s and 1960s understood, that there was a—

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** "Don't get caught in your own bullroar."

**Mr Mahoney:** What was that one? Don't get caught in your own bullroar. Yes, Barker would have said that. I'm absolutely sure he would have said that, along with my dad and many of those other cronies when they were making those great decisions in those days.

I don't know how many of the members opposite have ever had the privilege of going into the health clinic in Sault Ste Marie, one of the finest operations and examples of community health care, I think, that exists in the province, a model, and that too was started and built by the Steelworkers, by Johnny Barker, by my father and by many of the good men and women—mostly men in those days, I might add—involved in the labour movement, and particularly in steel.

I'm delighted that the Minister of Labour is here because I received a copy of a letter today. You talk about the history of the labour movement and the relationship with the New Democratic Party, and in many ways with the Liberal Party—more clearly with the New Democrats and with the CCFers before that—and the tradition that built up of the relationship. There's a problem, I guess, out there in the community today. It must be awfully hard for the current minister, Bob Mackenzie, a long-time member of the steel union and an advocate on behalf of workers. I remember in this place when the injured workers were breaking down the door. We've had to change the rules to tell them they can't demonstrate inside the place because of that.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** We had to replace the floor, too.

**Mr Mahoney:** They were banging down the doors and I think the current Minister of Labour and the current Premier were chanting at them to come on in. I think they were quite encouraging that. But in those days there was a bit of a different relationship and today it must be awfully difficult, I say to the member for Wentworth North, I believe it is. I'm sure you feel the pain when you go home and the phone calls that you must have to answer on the weekends from members of OPSEU or CUPE or anyone. I can appreciate the fact that with the difficult times—you don't get those phone calls, or you just don't return them? Maybe that's it. I don't know if I'd return them, maybe just save the pain, because you know what they're saying. Tell your staff that you're busy at Queen's Park all weekend and don't bother returning them.

But it must be awfully painful because there's been a metamorphosis, I guess is all you could say. It's been quite remarkable to go from this side of the political

spectrum and even bypass the traditional Liberal side and go right over to the Tory side. It's really been something.

And you had your provincial council on June 19, 1993, and I was particularly struck—what were there, four standing ovations for Bob? I guess you must have had people in the audience. It's like a leadership—what you do in a leadership convention is you get people in the audience whose job it is to lead the applause. So at the certain spontaneous time and moment when the Premier's speaking, I guess some of the members of the caucus were out there and jump to our feet. Peter, were you one of them? You were one of the cheerleaders? Did they give you uniforms and gloves or how did that work.

Anyway, I'm sure that must have happened for the Premier to get four standing Os. I can't imagine that they were awfully spontaneous.

When I received a letter today from the Canadian Union of Public Employees, you might know him, Mr Russ Whitney. Anyone know Russ? George, you know Russ. Wonderful guy, I understand. Writes a very, very impassioned letter to the Premier to express his deep concern with the government's position and actions on the social contract. Let me just tell you that one of the things that's most interesting about this is how we try to polarize all our different positions. You know, it's the socialists' job to paint the Liberals into one corner, paint the Tories into another corner, and if you're against the social contract, it means you're against restraint. Are all the unions that are against the social contract against restraint? They're taxpayers; the rank and file in CUPE are taxpayers. They have families, they have problems, they love this province, they have concerns. They don't like to see, whether it's the NDP in office or the Liberals or the Tories, budget deficits up in the five-figure range, \$10 billion plus. They don't like to see that. So they have concerns. Does that mean that because they oppose the social contract they're against restraint? Yet when we stand up in this party to take what clearly is a very traditional position for this party, to talk about our concerns about the impact of government legislation, the implication, whether it's from the third party or the government, is that we're opposed to restraint. It's absolute nonsense.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Where is the third party?

**Mr Mahoney:** That's not parliamentary, George. We're being gentle persons tonight, so settle down.

It really is nonsense to try to do that. I heard the Premier in response to the leader of the third party accuse him of not caring about the province. What kind of rhetoric have we sunk to in this place when a Premier of the province, regardless of whether you respect his political views, certainly we all must respect the office of the Premier of the province, and for the Premier of the province to stand up in this place—

**Mr Paul Johnson:** But do you, Steve?

**Mr Mahoney:** Of course I do; I respect that office. Of course I do, and I think you do, and for someone holding that office to accuse another member who obviously aspires to hold that office of not caring about this province simply because they question the direction and the economic platform of the current government, I just found that statement to be absolutely incredible. I think what that is, it's the current Premier reverting to his opposition days, when he would do anything, say anything, attack anyone, slay anyone with absolutely no remorse whatsoever. He's got a little bit of that statesman stuff because he's out there on the front page all the time and so people are saying, "Bob's not such a bad guy," and then he slides back into the gutter from where he was operating when he was Leader of the Opposition, and so all the acrimony comes out again. I found that most unfortunate.

1940

I don't mean to have to defend the leader of the third party. I find I disagree strongly with many of his policies. I find there are frankly a lot of things that are—how could I kindly put it?—phoney, that are not quite legitimate in that position, but I respect his office. I respect the fact that he was elected by his constituents, and then he was elected to be the leader of what was once a fine institution in this province, the Progressive Conservative Party.

One of the things that bothers me is that I think we are losing rapidly what little respect we have for each other in this place. I saw last night the acrimony. I felt the feelings that I had last night, and they're very dangerous. The whole situation is very dangerous, because there doesn't seem to be any attempt by the government to respect the fact that opposition has a role to play, that I respect the leader of the third party and the office he holds, I respect the leader of our party tremendously and the office that she holds and I respect the job the House leader has to do and that everybody has to do. I also share respect and understand the job that a backbencher over there has to do, because I had to do it.

I know how difficult it is to go back to constituents of traditional support, of pressure groups with traditional support, and tell them that you're going to do exactly the opposite of what you said you were going to do and that you're going to have to somehow justify that by saying—you can make up all the stories you want about how we were left in a mess. Your own Treasurer admitted that was not true in the first press conference that he held on that. But I don't want to argue that debate, because we spend a tremendous amount of time here in this place, blaming one another for the problems and frankly, as I said the other day in this place, I think there's enough blame to go around.

Before I get into the letter from our friend, Mr



Whitney from CUPE, I was recently in Atikokan. A member of the OSSTF came forward to us, and they were making a presentation. This individual said—I hope he's watching—he was part of the fine-tuned machine that helped put the NDP in office. He said, "Mr Mahoney, I'm ashamed because I've been betrayed." And then he said, "We are shopping for a party to support." Holding his vote here, dangling it in front of me, he said, "If you can defeat the social contract and if you can defeat the government, you might get our vote."

He sat down, and I said, "Sir, I think you should shop till you drop, because the problem in this province, in this country, is that special-interest groups are more concerned about their own interest than they are about the general interest and the good of the people of this province." It's time frankly, as politicians, that whether we're on that side of the House or on this side of the House, we had the guts to tell him that.

That doesn't mean you don't listen to them. That doesn't mean you're not concerned about what affects their everyday life because they're taxpayers too. But don't dangle your votes out there. Don't try to use a vote as an instrument of blackmail, because it just has got to stop.

You know what? I've got a simple policy. I'll listen to my constituents, I'll debate on a stage against the people running against me, and if at the end of the day, you don't like what I say, don't vote for me. Pretty simple, pretty fundamental. I think more of us in this business frankly—I see less of that than we need.

I see politicians at every level, why are we so discredited? This is an honourable profession. This is a profession that allows you, Mr Speaker, in your capacity for the folks in Haliburton, to get something done for them. For you to come to this place and to stand up and say, "I don't agree with casino gambling," or whatever it happens to be. That's an honourable profession. The folks at home want to see every one of us standing up and talking about the things that are of concern to them and to our communities.

Why have we fallen so low in the polls—not in the political polls, but—what's the word I want?—in the respect of the public. You see the senators gouging 6,000 bucks a piece, and you just read that stuff and you go, "Why would they be so stupid as to do something like that?" They destroy it for all of us, because in this business we are all judged by the lowest common denominator. Today, in the newspaper, the lowest common denominator in the political world happened to be a bunch of senators who decided they weren't getting enough out of the trough, so they gouged some more. When will we learn?

We all have responsibilities. There's a great hue and cry about all our mileage and our expenses. Once a year, all that stuff comes out. If you're doing the job,

for goodness' sake, there are costs involved. I find my constituents at least say, "You've got to do the job." They expect me to go to meetings. When I leave here tonight—it's quarter to eight on Thursday night—I've got two events I've got to attend in my riding, as I'm sure many of you do.

Because I live closer to my riding than some of you, I very often have to go there and come back two or three times in a day. If I don't do that, then those people I work for in Mississauga West say: "Where the heck's Mahoney? Doesn't he care about us?" Yet we get judged by the people who abuse those kinds of things. If we could only all collectively learn that we've got responsibilities to perform and responsibilities to one another.

I openly admit that in speeches in this place, I can get fairly rancorous perhaps at times and bitter, because there are some things that I feel very strongly about, that I think this government is doing wrong. I have an obligation, indeed a responsibility, as a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, to put that viewpoint across, and if you don't agree with me, that's fine; you stand up and say so.

But the minute that we stifle debate in this place—we've already changed the rules dramatically from what they were when the Liberals were in power and the Tories were in power, and there are some good aspects to that. I guess there are people who would say, "If you can't say what you want to say in 30 minutes, you probably shouldn't say it." Other constituencies around the country have rules like that, other legislatures. I don't have a big, big problem with that.

What bothers me is, I can remember the time—and you heard some of the speeches out of Hansard from the House leader and the Premier and other people, read by the member for Etobicoke West, about their feelings about closure and time allocation at the time that they were in opposition. It was their job, and there's a big difference here.

In this Parliament, I find that when we go out the door too much everything comes out with us. The only other experience I've had in this place, which was the Parliament from 1987 to 1990, that didn't happen. There were a couple of members of the NDP caucus whom I considered my closest friends in this place. I don't see them any more. It's not politically possible any more. I find that really unhealthy. We should be able to have our debates in here be within parliamentary rules, be acrimonious, be tough, be angry, make points and go out of here and leave it here. But we're not, and I don't know if we'll ever be able to get back to that. I really don't. It worries me.

I find that whatever the reasons—whether it's, I don't know, the great change—we went from 42 years in the wilderness to, all of a sudden in 1985, a coalition government; all of a sudden in 1987, a 95-seat majority

for the Liberals. I'm sure that the NDP, who were the official opposition at that time, must have felt somewhat like perhaps we feel today.

Then you make the complete turn to a 75, 74-member majority for the current government, so that the dynamics of the political change in this place, with the ideology that comes with being a party in opposition for so many years—able to go to the provincial councils that I referred to earlier and to adopt policies and positions, whatever they are, whether it's on the environment or the economy or whether it's on parliamentary procedure, the ability to be able to set a party's policy and direction without ever having the responsibility to govern—is something that I'm sure has come home and hit the current government full in the face.

As a result, they've got there and realized that—and I don't even care about the issues like Sunday shopping or auto insurance, I say to the House leader, who is the minister responsible for that. Frankly, I'm glad you made those decisions, because I just dreaded the thought of government-run auto insurance. I dreaded it when you guys were all shouting for it when we were in the government and I dreaded it even more when you finally became the government, because I don't believe in that kind of thing.

1950

I personally believe that if government can do something more expensively, or whatever it does, it will be more expensive than the private sector, it will be more bureaucratic, it will be less efficient. There are some things government must do. We must look out for the people who need our help in society. But why can't we let the people who can take care of themselves do that? Why can't we get off the back of the small business community and say to it, "We really think you can thrive just fine and we'll put in place some policies that maybe will give you a direction of what we see as where the conscience of the province should go"?

Why can't we say to them we believe in better training for occupational health and safety in the province without, Mr Minister of Labour, implementing a \$6.5-million agency to act as police for the thing? I say that with respect to the co-chairs of that agency, who I know are trying, but \$6.5 million is a lot of money.

Why can't we convince the business community—and I think we can—that less time off for its workforce through sickness or accidents mean a better bottom line for the company, which means growth and economic development, which means more jobs. The circle goes on and on. Isn't it common sense? What's that saying, that nobody knows why they call it common sense because it's not very common? But isn't it common sense? No, we've got to come in with these agencies. I don't care what they are.

Talk to me about pay equity. Who in fairness—I

don't care what your political stripe is—could disagree with the principles of pay equity? But once again we have set up by our government a \$6.5-million commission to act, in essence, as pay equity police. Maybe this recession/depression that we've gone through will give us an opportunity to say to people in the province of Ontario, "Look, you're going to have to start cooperating and buying into some of these fairness, equity and training programs so that we can eliminate all these agencies."

It's costing millions and millions of dollars. When I was the budget chief at the region of Peel for seven years the joke was, you know, "What's a million?" You spill more than that in this big regional government. Down here it's, "What's a billion?" Nothing's changed. We've got more government, bigger government. I don't think we're learning from our mistakes.

We made some mistakes. Let me tell you, I travelled all over this province for a year speaking to people and openly admitting to Liberals where we had made mistakes. We have to do that. Goodness gracious, they didn't throw us out of office because we did everything right. We made some mistakes. The Tories lost power after 42 years. Why can't they look in the mirror and say, "We made some mistakes"? Admit to some of those problems and let's find out what we can all do collectively.

What bothers me is that I see this government—and I'm, you might notice, trying to be a little less partisan than perhaps I normally am, but I really think we've got to address some of these things. I notice this government sort of making a decision—you know, it's like the Second World War bomber going through and the flak is coming up all over and it doesn't matter: "We're just going to keep our hand on the stick and we're going to get to the target and release the bombs and we don't care. That's what we've decided and we've just go to hold on to this."

Why can't we change that? For example, if you want to make this place more relevant, if you want to take the acrimony out of this place, why can't we finally get serious about parliamentary reform, why can't we talk about committees that aren't whipped? Don't send a bill to them. Don't send them legislation that's got—I realize that there is some that has come through.

The debate we're having tonight is on supply. You can't mess around with that. You've got to pay the bills. I understand that. We all understand that. That's why we agreed tonight that we would bring this bill to an end and we would have a vote, because we know that for any government to function, it has to pay the bills every day.

That's fine, but why can't we take some of the issues—you notice the issues that become the most acrimonious around here are things like auto insurance and Sunday shopping and these things. How many years



has that Sunday shopping been kicking around here? About 15 that people have been debating that? Why can't we send that out to a committee without instructions, or with instructions that simply say to that committee, "We'd like you to investigate this and see what the people of the province want, and report back to us in this place and tell us what your findings are"?"

I often talk about the select committee on education in here because I'm really fond of the memories of the work that committee did, with Richard Johnston, with Dianne Poole as Chair and I had the privilege of being Vice-Chair. In the work we did, you didn't see—well, there was a little bit of jabbing, but very little. We met with the stakeholders on issues of concern around education.

I see Mr Allen here, and I remember the work on the Constitution. I had the privilege of serving for a very brief time on that committee, and I was so impressed with how we worked together to try to come to a resolution that we could bring into this place with a united front. There was no partisanship there, because we were talking about Canada. We had a goal, a common purpose. One night, we almost went through the whole night, if I'm not mistaken. It was very impressive work and it made you feel, as a parliamentarian, like you really accomplished something. You didn't have to go home and say, "Boy, I kicked the heck out of them today." You went home and said, "You know, that Richard Allen had some good ideas." What is wrong with that, and why can't we get back there?

I think it's because the parliamentary system has become so dominated by the interest groups I mentioned earlier, so dominated by the press. The minute there's a headline, we all run around and we get our EAs on the phone and do this and do that and blame them and blame them. It's a circus, a real circus.

I mentioned pay equity. I got an urgent fax sent to me today by the Pay Equity Advocacy and Legal Services. They said they watched last night, with all the problems and the closure motion that was put by one of the members from London to take the vote on pay equity; this group is telling me we should stop messing around and vote on the thing. My immediate reaction and my staff's immediate reaction is, "The NDP phoned these guys and told them: 'Fax Mahoney. He's the whip.'" You see, everyone's shaking their heads, "Come on; we didn't do that," but that's my immediate reaction and that's my point. Maybe it did happen and maybe it didn't.

But the point is that we're losing the ability to govern. When we get into a situation like we did last night—I am an opposition member. That means I have a duty and a responsibility to oppose, hopefully to oppose constructively. It's not easy. You all know that better than I, because many of you were over here for

so many years and saw things you had to oppose. But I can remember when we were in government with that huge 95-member caucus. We'd go into meetings and Premier Peterson would walk in. We'd have had a bunch of debates for several hours, days—Peter Kormos, fond memories—and we'd ask Peterson, "Why can't we use the hammer?" The answer would be: "Just calm down and relax. We don't want to throw the place into disarray." I see the Attorney General is frowning, having been the one to defeat that particular member, but that's what happened; that's the truth. He would say: "We don't want to do that. We don't want to do that, because we want to make Parliament work. Let's let it drag on a little bit longer."

*Interjection.*

**Mr Mahoney:** You weren't here. Ask some of the members of your current cabinet who were here. It wasn't and it shouldn't be a very light decision to bring in time allocation and sure as heck shouldn't be a light decision to bring in closure.

There was always a debate about the mix of the two. We would time allocate and you guys would stand up and yell that we had brought in closure. Time allocation clearly says the debate will go here and there and here and there and then we will vote. Closure says vote now, no amendments, no further debate, no discussion, game over. The acrimony that we saw in this place and the tempers that were flaring were clearly a result of two closure motions put on two separate motions in the same evening. I say to the House leader, we've got to stop that. If you've got to have time allocation, put it forward. If that's the route, put it forward. We'll order our speakers. But closure is the most insidious tool that anybody in a true, democratic parliamentary system can use.

2000

Time allocation, you understand. You get your critics up, you get the debate out, you deal with the issue. You may not like it. You may rant and rave about it. You may accuse the government of stifling debate, but at least the debate, as structured as it may be in a time allocated motion, is still free debate. I must say, Speaker Warner probably saved this place from exploding last night. I happen to think he should have given you closure on the second motion and that the closure motion on the first motion should have been denied.

I readily admit that the person in the chair was a member of my own caucus. There were two rounds of debate in here when the closure motion was put, and it was accepted and the vote was done and it was over. On the pay equity bill, I admit there were some six or seven hours of debate and there was probably more justifiable cause to allow closure on that motion than on the first one, but Speaker Warner, in my view, recognized the tension that was in this place and made the wrong decision for the right reasons and saved us all

from a lot of grief and allowed us to go home and collect our thoughts and come back into this place.

I've only got a minute left. I can't believe it. I didn't even intend to talk about all that stuff, because I did want to tell the folks that Russ Whitney, the national representative for CUPE, was quite upset and is asking—he's begging, as a matter of fact. He says, as a member of the NDP, "For the party, for labour peace, for workers across this country, don't proceed with this legislation."

We're talking about the social contract. Our party is against that legislation. We think it's very damaging. We think it's creating chaos. We think this government has options; we've put them forward, the municipalities have put them forward. If we could ever break down the acrimony in here and what I sense too many times, the real peer dislike for one another, maybe we could get back to governing this province; maybe disagreeing, but at least bringing a sense of confidence to our people.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** Just briefly, I want to say that the presentation I just heard from my colleague across the way was, I thought, one of the more reasoned presentations we've had in this House in some time.

I have some difficulties, and I'll be as frank as I can right up front in the very few seconds I have on this. I think the acrimony around here is dangerous and is not helpful to the House. I think it's true that there is a growing dislike, and I think that's also a danger to the very traditions we're talking about.

I'm the first to admit that I'm not innocent in these matters, but I'd suggest you don't start that with an inference that I or my leader may have helped or encouraged workers to storm this Legislature. When the events that were being mentioned were happening, we were doing everything we could to see that that didn't happen, and I think it's important. I also don't think you start an excellent presentation, in my view, with accusing the leader of the government of somehow or other operating in and out of the gutter on issues.

Having said that, I want to make it very, very clear that I think there was some real meat in the comments that were made by my colleague across the way, and I think anything we could do in a legitimate and honest way to try and lower some of the temperature in here would be useful. That doesn't mean I agree with him on some of the positions he's taken or some of the arguments he's made, and I would reserve my right to be as tough as I wanted on those particular issues. But I think otherwise there is some real merit in the comments that have just been made, and it's the first presentation I've heard in this House in some long time that has been that positive. For that I say, well done.

**Mr Callahan:** I want to congratulate the member for Mississauga West as well. It's the first speech I've heard where he wasn't in an attack mode.

I want to pick up on one issue he raised. I think it's a very important issue and it's one that we, as members of the Legislature, are going to have to deal with. We have to deal with the reform of this place. This place is an anachronism, with all due respect. There is very little power. People elect 130 members to this Legislature. They pay our salaries and they expect us to produce: They expect us to have input from our ridings and perspective in all the legislation that comes through here. Unfortunately, that's not the way it works, as you well know.

What happens is that a few people in the government, the Premier, about four cabinet ministers and about six unelected, as we lovingly call them, spin doctors down on the second floor in the Premier's office—and I'm not suggesting it's just your government—decide from the polls they've taken with taxpayers' dollars what will get them re-elected so they can come back to power. That's how public policy in this province is shaped.

I tell you something, I'm not going to be around here that much longer, but I will feel very uncomfortable if I don't see some direct efforts being taken by all members of the House to reform this institution, because in my mind, it's nothing more than a big club. The decisions that are made are not made for the benefit of the people of the province of Ontario; they're made for the benefit of the politicians. It's time the people who elected us got what they paid for, got what they expected, got what they deserved and stopped this entire joke that goes on, not just here but in Ottawa.

Parliamentary democracy in Canada doesn't work. It's a big club, and it's got to change. We watched the senators today gouge the eyes out of the people of Canada.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I want to commend and thank the member for Mississauga West. I thought most of his speech was quite useful, unlike his colleague's, Mr Callahan, who just spoke. Mr Callahan might have missed a couple of shots at my leader with respect to the social contract. I do want to follow up on not only the member for Mississauga West's comments but also the Minister of Labour with respect to the conduct in this House and particularly last night.

I too am obviously not innocent. Hot heads were prevailing much of last night. There was good reason for it. It's hard to explain to the public what it's like and what the frustration is on this side of the House when you have difficulty expressing the concerns of your constituents because you're under time constraints and because the government brings in closure motions to further limit your ability to debate in our democracy.

I do want to remind members, though, that Parliament is a substitute for war. As I tell school children who come here and wonder what we do some days when they sit in the galleries and watch question period, Parliament is indeed a substitute for war. In other



countries, where they don't have the ability to come here and debate in a forceful manner, they simply shoot each other.

Everyone should go back to their political science textbooks and realize that this is, in essence, a courtroom for the people of Ontario. It is an adversarial system. As the Minister of Labour said, I do reserve the right to speak out forcefully on behalf of my constituents who feel from time to time that they're not being listened to by the government of the day.

In fact, it applies to the very symbols of this place. The mace is a symbol of warfare; it was originally the sovereign's battle club. The distance between the front rows of the government benches and the front rows of the opposition benches is exactly the distance of two men with outstretched swords in hand. It's a reminder that we have to be civil to each other because we live in a civilized parliamentary democracy, but it is also a reminder that this forum is here to express our views in strong terms but to part friends.

**Mr Mahoney:** I want to say to Mr Wilson that I appreciated the analogy of this being a substitute for war. I guess the gist of my comments was that I want us to keep it that way. When you take a look at what goes on in other parts of the world—later on tonight I'll be speaking at a Croatian hall. We all know the heartache of this community, with the terrible situation that's gone on in the former Yugoslavia, with really everyone involved over there. It's even caused a good friend of mine, Mr John Sola, a tremendous amount of pain and the obvious result of him not being part of our caucus at the present time.

2010

In any event, let me just say to the Minister of Labour that the tone of the speech being one of worry and concern does not detract in any way from—I would not expect you not to be tough on issues nor would I expect you to expect me to lay down and simply say, "Well, gee, that's okay," because if we became friends, just because we're friends doesn't mean that we're not adversaries within the political spectrum. I really think that that's so important.

As I said earlier, I won't mention them by name, but there were two members of the current NDP cabinet who I considered personal friends, who we used to socialize with on a regular basis. That's not doable under the atmosphere that exists in this place, and I find that regrettable.

Having said that, I think that my caucus might give me a kick if I didn't say that we do have serious concerns about some of the things that this government is doing that are not based purely on partisanship. We have concerns when we ask about the plans for the municipalities to be able to find ways to dig themselves out of the problem, with the inability that they have to perhaps deal with the cuts that they require in other

ways, and with no time left, just to say that I really did appreciate the comments of the Minister of Labour and hopefully we can get on to some good things in this province.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Any further debate?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I'm pleased to have a few minutes to speak to a number of issues in my riding of Simcoe West. I take the opportunity during the supply motion to do that and I want to begin on a positive note, in all sincerity, and thank the government, and particularly the Minister and Ministry of Transportation, for installing traffic lights on Highway 26 at the intersection of Highway 26 and Mosley Street of Wasaga Beach.

This may not seem like a terribly big issue to some people in urban areas where traffic lights are quite frequent, but I am a resident of Wasaga Beach. Having been born and raised at the south end of my riding, in Alliston, the last year or so I've resided in the north end of Wasaga Beach. For 18 years we've pleaded with successive governments to recognize that there is a problem at this particular intersection, and I was pleased that some three weeks ago the Ministry of Transportation began the construction of, and now they're in operation, new traffic lights.

I'd like to think that I had something to do with moving the government along to the position of actually putting up the lights, perhaps not myself but one of my staff back in December. After a lengthy day in the riding with me, one of my constituency assistants managed to smash up his girlfriend's mother's car at this particular intersection. It was the last straw for both myself and the residents and obviously for the government when I came back to the Legislature and indicated to the government once again the hazards in that area.

I thank the Ministry of Transportation for doing that. It means a lot to the tourist trade. Often, coming out of Mosley Street on to Highway 26, it could be up to a 30- to 35-minute wait when the stop sign was there because there's so much traffic going north and south to Collingwood, back and forth to Collingwood on Highway 26. With the stop lights, everything's working much better.

However, on a little more of a sour note, the same minister, M. Pouliot, has not responded, I think, in a fair way to another situation in another section of highway near Collingwood, and that's Highway 24, just south of Collingwood. Two or two and a half years ago the government quite rightly decided to redevelop that section of highway. They elevated the highway and, unfortunately, an undesired consequence was that there is now flooding in a number of the ditches along that highway.

This again may not seem like such a big issue to a number of people, except for the fact that where I come

from and where the residents of Nottawasaga township, where the piece of highway is located, come from, is that they didn't create the problem, that the government and its engineers and the people they pay to engineer and construct the new road, simply messed up and simply created a terrible drainage problem. But rather than the government admit its mistakes—and it wouldn't cost very much money—I'm told by the regional office of the Ministry of Transportation that it could find the money if directed by the government to do so, to correct the drainage problem.

As it turns out, it has become a national issue. This issue was on one of the CBC national news programs. It's also been featured a couple of times on the local CKVR station in Barrie. I've had calls from a couple of provinces about this, because the government is petitioning for a municipal drain and going to force adjacent property owners and downstream property owners to pay for its mistake.

I simply ask the government, in the time I have, to revisit that issue, because I don't think it's fair, the national media doesn't think it's fair, and I really don't know any other way. We've tried every route to try to convince the government that it made the mistake. The NDP talked a lot about fairness, and if you really want to practise fairness, here's an example where in terms of money in a very small way you could practise fairness in my riding.

The worst part is I wrote the minister. I got back a form letter. I've talked to the minister, I've given him photos, and I'm the only one communicating with my constituents. The Ministry of Transportation and the minister himself have never bothered to communicate directly, in recent months anyway, with my constituents.

I do a regular radio show in Collingwood called the Chat Show, and, needless to say, two weeks ago I had a few calls with respect to this issue, people mainly complaining now that the government doesn't seem to listen to them. We hear that on a number of fronts.

The second issue I want to raise—and the Minister of Agriculture and Food was here a few minutes ago; I think he just went to the back room to grab a cup of coffee, because we do have these late-night sittings—is one that's of great concern to the newly amalgamated area of New Tecumseth. The town of New Tecumseth was created by the Liberal government in a forced restructuring or amalgamation of the former town of Alliston, the village of Beeton, the township of Tecumseth and the village of Tottenham, which have come together to form New Tecumseth.

I say this to other members in Simcoe county and other parts of the province that may be forced to restructure by governments which claim they know better than the people themselves, that one of the downsides is you've got to come up with a new official plan. In New Tecumseth, the Ministry of Agriculture

and Food, or as my constituents call it, the Ministry of Aggravation and Frustration, has decided that New Tecumseth, since it now must develop a new official plan, will become the guinea pig with respect to zoning.

We have in that township, Mr Speaker, as you may have in rural parts of eastern Ontario, a specific designation now, which is a rural-agricultural designation for zoning purposes. The ministry has come along and said, "You must split that designation," and it has said this in a very forceful and ill-mannered way to the committee which is developing proposals for the new official plan.

I'll get into how the ministry has insulted farmers in my riding in just a minute, because I will read an excerpt from a local newspaper article. But I just want to say to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, whom I've given a number of letters to, whom I've spoken to a number of times on this issue—and I'm still awaiting his response, as are the people of my riding—that it's very well and fine to say that you want to preserve agricultural land. But, I say to the Minister of Natural Resources, who is here, to do it solely on the backs of farmers in Tecumseth township is pretty unfair.

The problem we have is that farmers are not making a decent living, particularly farmers close to Toronto. Now, this area of the province is just outside the GTA, although Ruth Grier, when she was Environment minister, kept trying to drag this part of the province into the GTA. But it's immediately north of Highway 9 in Simcoe county.

The current rural-agricultural designation allows us some flexibility with respect to development and land use. To split it off and to say to farmers, "The status quo is no good and Big Brother knows best, ie, the NDP government, and you must designate much of that former dual designation, it must be split and designated strictly agricultural," is unfair because it limits our ability to—really, it limits the ability of these farmers to retire in dignity. All they have is their land. We don't have, as in other countries, pensions for our farm community, and hence all they have is the land.

I've had a very difficult time explaining this to OMAF reps. The minister seems to understand, but OMAF reps don't seem to understand. We had bank managers in before the planning committee to explain that if you do this, they're immediately going to check the loans of these farmers, because with a rural-agricultural designation there is a greater potential for development on that land and there is therefore a greater value, a speculative value, assigned to that land that bank managers take into account as part of their thinking process when it comes to extending money to farmers, particularly during the beginning of the growing season.

2020

I say two things on this issue. One is that prosperous farmers will jealously guard farm land. In my area, on



my mother's side of the family we still have a family farm. I come from agricultural roots. I lived for the first year of my life in Colgan, which is a very small area in Adjala township, right next to the area I'm speaking about in terms of the official plan amendments or proposal.

I know that if farmers are making a living, there's no problem with preserving the land. When they're not making a living and when the government comes along and says it wants to put a greenbelt between where we live in our part of the province and Metro—they want to put a greenbelt but they don't want to pay for it—I say if you want to make Tecumseth township a greenbelt, then be prepared to buy the farmers out at fair market value, lease the land back and they'll keep the weeds down and the land in production.

That's happened in other areas of the province. For some reason this government, because it doesn't have the money but it has some environmental and green space goals, has decided to take the Food Land Guidelines route, the official plan route and force farmers to be designated for ever in poverty. That's unfair, and I'm going to plead again with the government and the Minister of Agriculture and Food to revisit this issue.

I want to read the attitude that's been bestowed upon my constituents by a local Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food bureaucrat. I just want to read for a minute here.

It says, "The New Tecumseth Planning for the Future Committee loaned its voice as a forum for the farming community and its contenders Wednesday night." It's a very recent article. "Sharon Johnston, district manager for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food spoke to the issue of enforcing a strictly agricultural designation on what is now a rural agricultural 'status quo'."

"Agriculture was considered an 'industry' by Johnston, with the Food Land Guidelines ensuring key areas are kept for agricultural purposes. According to Johnston, a strict agricultural designation for special crop land and high productivity is vital in creating the official plan."

In other words, OMAF has come from down on high and indicated, "You've got split this and we're not prepared to listen to anything."

Roger George, president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, attended that meeting. I was unable to attend it, but Mr George graciously did and brought credibility, I think, to what the farmers—and there were some 65 at the meeting—were saying.

"Roger George, president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, voiced opposition to the policy saying the guidelines are outdated.

"We can't make policies if something is not viable," he charged. 'Allow a decent living with traditional farm

assets.'

"George, backed by the entire assembly of approximately 65 farmers, spoke out against ministry guidelines that restricted rural-agricultural land designations.

"He supported the split designation to allow a wider range of use. Flexibility was needed for economic growth."

He goes on to say, "There are farmers who are not global traders. Not all are prime production. I urge you not to be stampeded by the Ministry of Agriculture."

"The farming community challenged Johnston's"—that's the bureaucrat—"arguments by citing difficulties in obtaining financing for strictly agricultural land." I spoke about the attitude of bank managers with respect to strictly agriculturally zoned land.

"The first thing the bank manager asked is the value of the best crop I can grown on the land," said one farmer.

"Who's going to get in an industry that's not in sound financial state?" asked another."

More important, I want to talk about this:

"Laughter greeted Johnston's reference to the multi-million-dollar holdings of Caledon's Armstrong family to reflect farming potential in New Tecumseth.

"Further, she charged those farmers wishing to survive were not present, as they were satisfied with their lot:

"I don't think we had the ones who want to survive." She cited 150 farms generating over \$100,000 annually."

This particular newspaper checked that fact. The fact is, it says, "(In confirming statistics, the Ministry of Agriculture could only state there were 812 with sales over \$50,000 in Simcoe county.)" That's sales. That's not profit. Most of those farms didn't make any money. In fact, they lost money.

"Farmers responded with a demand for a voice in making policy, rather than Queen's Park or another municipality. They supported the 'status quo' of rural agricultural zoning."

The final comment is a quote from a local farmer who says, "If it's not broken, don't fix it."

The point is a bureaucrat named Ms Johnston, who is a district manager of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, showing up at a local planning meeting, citing that farmers make \$100,000 a year, citing an example of a Caledon farm many, many miles away, an entirely different type of farming operation, nothing like what we have in my riding, and claiming that was the true plight of farmers in Ontario, that they're all rich.

This bureaucrat, I don't think, ever worked on a farm. I don't think this bureaucrat spent a day on a farm and I don't think this bureaucrat's visited too many bank managers with respect to farm operations. It was an

insult. I've told the minister to get that person out of the field. She's an insult to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, which at one time went to bat for farmers and in recent years has been fighting farmers.

It is a big issue in my riding. Not only were 65 farmers present at that meeting, there have been other meetings. Over 200 have signed petitions asking that the status quo remain. I again bring that to the government's attention and will continue to do so.

In conversations with the minister, to be fair, he agrees with me that perhaps the best thing to do would be—he won't budge on splitting the designation, rural-agricultural, he wants it split, but he said, "Maybe we'll make it all rural."

I say that's good, because if my farmers can't make a living and if people aren't prepared to pay farmers what they're worth, then we're going to have to grow houses. There's enough development pressure in that part of the province and we've got enough farm land in the rest of the province to allow us to grow houses, which would ensure that my farmers have a decent retirement income.

Secondly, as I said, if the government wants to go about its merry ways and try and put a greenbelt there, it had better be prepared to buy out those farmers and lease the land back. I think that's the only thing that's fair and I think taxpayers throughout the province, if you explain this to them very clearly, would absolutely agree with that.

Finally, I want to thank Mrs Helga Elie, who was very helpful to me and has represented farmers on the New Tecumseth planning committee with respect to this issue. She was the one responsible for inviting Roger George to the meeting and has done just an excellent job. It's unfortunate that the ministry of aggravation and frustration is really ruining this poor lady's life. I've visited Helga many times at her home with her husband Theo and she has spent many a sleepless night worrying about this issue. It's unfair. There's no need for it if some common sense would be brought back to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

I want to use the 13 minutes remaining to go over what some of my constituents have been saying. Recent surveys to my riding—when we send out our householders, I always have a survey section. The responses are quite interesting. All of the responses, or the vast majority, indicate that the most salient issues to my constituents are the deficit, the growth of government and government waste. I say to the government members, listen carefully.

I would particularly like to tell the Liberal members, if there were any here, to listen carefully because their stand on the social contract or the principles of the social contract, which is what we voted on on second reading, the principles of deficit reduction and control

of government spending, is hypocritical. They run around pretending they're now fiscal conservatives, that they understand the need to get government waste and government spending under control, but when the crunch comes, they're afraid to do anything. They're afraid to do anything.

At least Bob Rae in recent weeks has come around to trying to address the issue and we're trying to help him. We voted for the social contract on second reading because the principle is what we've been preaching, and I think one thing the public wants above all else is that politicians be consistent, that we not say one thing in the 1990 campaign and come here and do something else. However, we've left our options open on third reading.

Mr Rae has been presented by my leader, Mike Harris, with a number of amendments that we would like to see in the social contract legislation. We're trying to make the legislation more humane. We're trying to put some more common sense in there and preserve the principles of deficit reduction, government spending controls etc.

2030

On the topic of deficits, in the last two surveys to my riding, the majority of people surveyed said the most important issue facing Ontario was debt and deficits. The following is a sample of some of the comments made by my constituents:

Mr Bert Schaly of New Lowell says the most important issue for him is "the rising debt load in all areas of government."

Mr G. Woods of Wasaga Beach says, "Debt reduction must be more sincerely tackled by all levels of government."

Craig Fraser of Alliston—and I must thank Craig, he writes me fairly often, a young lad, a tremendously bright person—says: "The deficit of Ontario seems to be soaring out of control. It seems to change every week. The NDP must start to control it."

Jim Thompson of Collingwood says the government "is spending money unwisely with no hope of paying it back."

Les Aldis of Alliston says the most important issue facing the government of Ontario is "stimulating the economy, especially by measures to help small businesses, whilst controlling and reducing their deficits."

Roy Emerton of Creemore says the most important issue facing Ontario is "governments that don't have to balance their bank books like every other person has to."

Mr and Mrs Gibson of Alliston say that the most important issue for the government is "the deficit which continues to grow and is out of control like the Hydro."

On the second topic, growth in government, my constituents also believe there is too much government



and that the bureaucracy should be reduced.

Mr and Mrs Kosierb of Collingwood say, "Create new jobs and cut bureaucracy."

G. Bruce McKendrick of Collingwood says, "Government employees at all levels are not sharing cost cutting measures that are necessary."

Sam Sharpe of Collingwood says: "There is too much government. Government should reduce taxes and interference in small business."

My neighbour, who lives at 164 Smallman Drive, Mr Jessop of Wasaga Beach, says: "Tight times equal tight measures. We must cut back and manage our budgets better; so must the governments."

Mr J. Robbins of Collingwood says the most important issue facing the government is "cutting back on spending, starting with downsizing the bureaucracy."

Mr Nelder of Cookstown says, "There is too much government at every level."

Ms Watt of Loretto says, "There should be more house cleaning done by our government and they should be made more accountable with our money."

Mr Bill Barr, a dear friend of mine who recently lost his son, of Wasaga Beach, says the most important issue facing the provincial government is "curtail the irresponsible whirlwind of spending on which they have embarked."

Mr Harwood of Tottenham says the government should "get costs under control. Don't fire people but make all of them take two weeks off per year without pay."

C. B. Camplong says, "The government should cut costs, not raise taxes."

Under the topic of government waste, my constituents believe that the social safety net has turned into a hammock and that there's too much fraud in the social service system. More accountability could eliminate the need for the government's panicky social contract legislation.

Mr Chris Coleman of Tottenham believes the most important issue under this category facing the government of Ontario is "tighten control of social assistance payments."

Ruth Hughes of Creemore says: "Where is the quality assurance program for OHIP? Does it not check the approved services versus the billings?"

Again, today in the Legislature, as Health critic for the Ontario PC Party, I brought another example of OHIP fraud where there were double billings with respect to hysterectomies.

Dr Maurice O'Neil of Collingwood says, "Abuse of government services at all levels and lack of will for government to prosecute abuses." That's what Dr Maurice O'Neil, who has become a great adviser to me, said with respect to the important issue facing the

government of Ontario.

Eric Elliot of Angus says, "The welfare system has to be reformed to stop the ripoffs."

Mrs Bennett of Tottenham believes the most important issue facing the government of Ontario is "Welfare: Too many people claiming benefits to which they are not really entitled."

Kelly Lawes of Collingwood says the government should "thoroughly investigate the welfare system to prevent misuse."

That's a sampling of my mailbag. I've spared reading you the entire text of those good people's comments, but it's clear to me that when you send out two surveys and you get back overwhelming responses and of those responses, the vast majority want the government to get spending under control, I think it's important that we listen to those concerns.

The government, I think, after telling us in the last two and a half years that you could spend your way out of a recession, has finally come around to hearing that segment of society which the polling actually shows is the vast majority of Ontarians, and certainly that's reflected very clearly in my riding and in the comments I've just read. People believe there's been a vast growth in government, and they're right.

My predecessor, George McCague, who was the Chairman of Management Board during the last six full years of the Ontario PC government during the Bill Davis era, very quietly through an attrition program slashed 8,800 civil servants over the last six years that he was Chairman of Management Board. The problem with George is that he forgot to put out a press release.

When Mr Peterson came to office, I argue government changed. You can't do anything around here unless you put out a press release. The red track suits and the red ties and the flamboyant style meant that you really, really, really had to get in the ball game of informing the public, and the style of politics changed.

George McCague and his colleagues at the time, I think, believed, as we do today, in good management. George wasn't flamboyant in either his presentations in the House or in his management style. But it was a sound management style. I think the hardest thing that our predecessors, when they went into opposition, had to deal with was the fact that they really didn't know what they were to do in opposition in terms of getting their message out. We've corrected that. Mike Harris has brought this party a long way.

To Mr Davis and to our predecessors of that era, good management came naturally and it didn't warrant a press release, hence they weren't used to having to explain. To cut back on the number of bureaucrats—now 93,000 that work for us here at Queen's Park and in the ministries—to cut back on those in the early 1980s was a natural thing. The government of the day

sensed the public was tired of the big government of the mid-1970s. The government had got too big and it simply through attrition—and really no one got hurt.

It's that type of approach that our amendments to Bill 48 reflect. It's with that type of commonsense approach that we're trying to get Premier Rae to change his social contract legislation, adopt some of our measures, as I said earlier, to make it more humane legislation.

It's tough out there, I know. My mother is a teacher and she, quite understandably, does not like Bill 48 or the social contract legislation. But she says to me that if we don't do something now, it's going to be worse in two years, and she might even lose her job in two years, and that would be very sad because she's close to retirement. She realizes that governments have lived beyond their means, that a \$68-billion debt is really immoral and that \$10-billion deficits every year, if that's what we're going to have, are immoral, that it's not right to pass on our problems to the next generation, and I agree with her.

I'm the generation that grew up believing you could get something for nothing. I think we went through many years of my parents and their generation where the programs were being added on and added on, until recent years. The bills weren't necessarily ever going to be paid is what we kind of figured out in the afterthought, and I and many of my friends are stuck paying the bills, as are the people of Ontario now. The chickens have come home to roost.

We realize that something has to be done. I don't think Bob Rae, to be fair to the Premier, takes any perverse pleasure in having to bring in this social contract legislation, in having to take on unions, in having to bring in expenditure controls. I don't think he enjoys that, nor did we enjoy voting for that principle on second reading.

But unlike, I know Mr Phillips will get up and argue, what we've seen from the Liberal side—they've not offered alternatives. They've simply opposed every expenditure restraint measure that the government has brought forward, and I think that's unfair and I don't think that's responsible.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** You've got to admire them, though, for being able to sit on that picket fence.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Yes. The minister says you've got to admire the Liberals for being able to sit on the picket fence, and it's a balancing act indeed.

2040

**Mr Phillips:** The Conservatives aren't going to vote in favour of this bill, though. The Conservatives aren't going to vote in favour of the bill, are they, or are they?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Mr Phillips, when you speak, I'll be sure to interrupt you.

So in summation, I've enjoyed my 30 minutes here. I hope I've brought forward some concerns on behalf of

my constituents. I hope the government has taken note of those. I will certainly be following up on the Nottawasaga drain issue, on the zoning designation in New Tecumseth. We'll be talking a lot more in the few days coming about the social contract. We'll be watching the Premier to see what he does with respect to that legislation while it's here in committee of the whole House.

I remind people that yes, one out of four Ontarians work in the greater public sector, but three out of four Ontarians don't. Many of them are unemployed and they have no hope of a job as long as we have huge deficits and debts. That's the fact of the matter. Even the New Democratic Party that promised the world has finally come to its senses, to a certain extent anyway, on that issue. We want to encourage them to embrace expenditure controls. I suggest they do a little more on the home front here, with the 93,000 civil servants we have here at Queen's Park, and I look forward to further debates on these and other issues.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** Questions and/or comments.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I regret that I was not here for all of the member's speech, and I know he ranged far and wide and commented on a broad number of issues, but I couldn't allow the opportunity to pass without commenting on some of the points that he made.

I listened very carefully when he said that for the Conservative government, which we all know was here for 42 years, good management meant not sending out a press release. He then went on to talk about one of his predecessors, a member with whom I served in this House who, as chair of Management Board, diminished the civil service by thousands of public servants, but there was no announcement.

What distresses me is the pleasure and the pride that the member opposite seems to take in the fact that these kinds of decisions were made behind closed doors and that there was no sense on the part of the government that it governed for, with and alongside the people of this province and on behalf of the people of this province, and that the people of this province had a right to perhaps be informed of those decisions, participate in those decisions or, perish the thought, sit down at the bargaining table and perhaps discuss whether in fact these same objectives could be achieved in a better way.

That is what this government has tried to do and that responds to the demands of the people of this province in the 1990s. No longer can decisions be made by fiat. No longer are decisions made by cabinet without the participation of the public or of the public servants, and that is how it should be.

He also talked about the spending in that era and acknowledged that the chickens were coming home to roost, and they have indeed—spending that was done without any concern for the future. I'm glad the member



recognizes that there ought to have been that concern for the future because the other thing he said was that farmers in his area had no choice but to grow houses. If ever there was a shortsighted approach to the future of this country and to future generations, that is it.

**Mr Phillips:** I wanted to comment on the member's speech, much of which was, I thought, useful.

The one thing I want to comment on is a remark he made around the social contract and the view on how the social contract might be handled. I know often we don't listen to things that are said in the House, but I would just say that my leader, Lyn McLeod, made a recommendation at least eight weeks ago on how to handle this situation. I think the way the House operates, oftentimes I don't think the Premier was listening when she said it. She said that in her opinion this is a very straightforward way to handle the situation. You give the employer community and the employee community clear guidelines on the amount of money that has to be saved and then you give those individuals, those groups the tools to reach their own agreement.

That's the recommendation she made eight weeks ago. You can check Hansard and you'll find it's there. Very straightforward, very simple and one that, in our opinion, would have allowed this process to work.

The other thing she said was that the government should sit down with OPSEU, its own employees, and reach a model agreement so at least that could be shown as a model that the other employers could use. That was the recommendation eight weeks ago.

What we've now got is a proposal that I'm afraid won't work. I think it's unsaveable. I think it is so complicated, with sectoral agreements, local agreements, and then in the final analysis, for the next three years, the minister—I gather it will be the Minister of Finance—will have to approve every collective agreement in the province. I just don't think that's workable.

I think the recommendation that my leader made eight weeks ago is the one that should have been followed; I still think it's the one that will be followed. I'm afraid we're going to find in five weeks that we've got a very unworkable bill before us.

**Mr Turnbull:** I'd like to congratulate my colleague the member for Simcoe West for a very thoughtful debate, which is typical for him.

I'm very sorry, after having heard another very thoughtful dissertation by the member for Mississauga West earlier tonight, which I thought was a very non-partisan type of comment, to hear the Minister of Health with her comments with respect to my colleague.

She criticized the fact that the Conservative government reduced the civil service through attrition and the fact that, she said, it made the decision behind closed doors. No, they didn't. They simply managed the economy properly and didn't spend millions of dollars

on propaganda. For the Minister of Health to make that as a criticism and then to walk out before she can even hear the response, the rebuttal, from my colleague the member for Simcoe West I think is crude and inappropriate and it lowers the tone of debate.

So far this evening, there has been a good quality of debate, thoughtful debate. I particularly was listening to, as I said, Mr Mahoney in his debate where he was dwelling on some of the problems that exist in this province and offering some solutions.

I'm rather sad to think that the government is reacting with this knee-jerk reaction of just simply criticizing the fact that the Conservatives ran the economy properly and reduced the civil service without a great hoopla, but simply ran it efficiently so that this province was a very viable place to live. There are an awful lot of people wishing they could return to those days.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Simcoe West has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I want to thank the Minister of Health, the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt and my colleague in the PC caucus the member for York Mills, Mr Turnbull, for their thoughtful comments.

I don't know. I didn't take the Minister of Health's comments too badly. I think she missed the point. The point is that we say, in a commonsense way in my riding, that we maybe have to grow houses on our farm land if the government is going to force us into perpetual poverty by designating the land, through some social theory, strictly agricultural when farmers have no other retirement income.

I'm a little tired of the Minister of Health, who has a home in my riding up in Glen Huron, coming up on weekends and staring at us as if we're some perpetual Kodak moment. My constituents and the farmers in my riding are entitled to make a living, and if you don't like it, get out of government, because you're not doing any service to the people of this province who produce your food. To come up and stare at us on weekends and want us to live in a picture frame is a little unfair, because the policies that follow this government seem to be that: "We also want you poor. We don't want you to develop, we don't want you to make a living and, for God's sakes, don't have a decent retirement like MPPs. Just stay the way you are."

To a certain extent, we agree. We'd like to stay the way we are in Tecumseth township, so we ask the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to get off our backs and to let us keep our rural-agricultural designation, let us keep the status quo and let us live for another 200 years as farmers, dealing with God's land and providing your food.

2050

**Mr Phillips:** I'm pleased to join the debate on the

vote on supply. Just in case people aren't aware of what we're doing here, we will be voting, I assume, later this evening to permit the government to have the necessary funds to pay its bills. It's a normal debate that we have. It does provide the members an opportunity for a relatively wide-ranging debate. I'd like to focus my comments on the economy and on the budget, in that we will be looking for funds to help the government to implement its spending plans.

I think members of the House know that the most troubling page in the budget for me was the page that spelled out the unemployment situation. It's on page 45, for any of the people who are interested in the budget and perhaps have copies of it. I thought the government was actually mildly courageous putting this chart in, because it shows what I believe and what the government believes to be the real situation on unemployment.

I would say to the people of Ontario, we are in the middle—I hope it's only the middle; I hope it's not the beginning—of a whole new unemployment situation. We, as a province, have never seen unemployment rates that will run in the double digits for at least five years.

The chart I'm referring to points out that while Statistics Canada, the group that reports the unemployment numbers, says Ontario has an unemployment rate of 10.7%, the real unemployment rate is 14%. The reason for that is, as the budget points out, there is a large number of people who have simply stopped looking. Everyone knows they're out there, everyone knows they would like to be in the workplace, but they've simply dropped out. What this chart shows is that the real unemployment rate in Ontario is now 14%; by 1995 it gets down to perhaps 13%, and it just barely gets below 12% in 1997.

So, for me at least, the most serious part of the budget is that we are now looking at unemployment rates that will run dramatically higher than we have seen before for a very long period of time. I've raised this issue in the House because these numbers reflect the government's plans. The government knows what its plans are now, what its plan will be over the next two to three years, and this is going to be the result of it.

The Finance minister, Mr Laughren, was at our finance and economic affairs committee this afternoon. I had an opportunity to ask him that question and he confirmed, yes, this is taking into account the plans they've got and the situation as they're best able to predict it. We are looking at real unemployment numbers in that 13% range after 1995.

I raise this because I don't think we in the province, we in the Legislature, have begun to really internalize that and say to ourselves, "What does that mean?" This, in my opinion, will be the first time in at least 50 years in the province where we will go through a long period of time where a large number of qualified people who are anxious to find jobs will not be able to find jobs for

a considerable period of time.

As I say, I spend a fair bit of time looking at this. When you're in opposition, you have a little more time on your hands than if you're a minister, so this is an area I have an interest in. I've gone back 50 years in unemployment and we've never gone through this stretch.

I realize that right now we are all of us, particularly the government, involved in dealing with the fiscal side of the economy. That's an important side and I will touch on that shortly, but I really don't think we've turned our mind to what this means.

Some of our friends in the Maritimes have had this situation for some time. I don't think they've learned to live with it, but they've dealt with it, and I'm sure not all that effectively at some time.

I'm not suggesting that the solutions are easy, but until all of us recognize the magnitude of the problem, we won't begin to find the solutions. I commend the government for putting that chart in, because I think it highlights for us—look at the 1982 recession. We had one year of double-digit, 10.5% one year and then it got below that and eventually we saw it drop to 5%. Go back and look at the unemployment rate in the 1960s, and it's tough to think it was a 3% unemployment rate.

It seems that what is happening is that we have a level of unemployment, and then we have a recession and it goes up and it never comes back down again to the level it was pre-recession. We go along, we have another recession; it goes way up and then it drops down, but never as low as it was before the recession.

So this is a challenge for all of us. Frankly, the solutions aren't going to be easy. I accept that. If you follow what's going on in Europe right now, there's an enormous debate in the European Community just in the last week, where the European Community is facing a similar situation—not to the same extent, but a similar situation—and it's split on how to deal with it. There's a raging debate, but they're having the debate at least.

I think the thing we can conclude with certainty is that jobs will not be created, we will not see a growth in jobs in the public sector in the next five years. That's something that looks to me like it's a given, and as we know, about 20% of jobs are in the public sector or broader public sector. When we talk broader public sector, by the way, just so the public is aware, that includes in that 20% the doctors, the teachers, the university professors and all those people.

There is no doubt that the growth will have to come in the 80% private sector. The Minister of Energy is nodding his head, and I think we all accept that, but I will just say it's not going to be that easy. If you look at where the jobs are in the private sector, historically 20% of the jobs in this province have been in manufacturing, about a million jobs. There are five million



people who work in the province, as you know. Historically, about a million work in manufacturing, but even in the boom times in manufacturing, probably the last really good period was the late 1980s, where manufacturing output went up dramatically but the number of jobs in manufacturing actually declined. From 1985 to 1990, the number of people working in manufacturing actually declined in spite of the fact there was an enormous increase in output.

So it won't come in manufacturing. Even though I think we need to collectively put an enormous effort into our manufacturing sector, jobs will not come in the manufacturing sector. Output will grow, but we will not see significant growth in jobs.

It will not be in what they call the trade sector, retail and wholesale. In fact, the jobs are declining fairly significantly there. For those of us who watch the retail sector, you'll see very large stores coming on the scene that have a very small labour component; these huge warehouse stores employ very few people compared to the traditional smaller stores. So it won't be in that area.

It will not be in the agricultural sector. It won't be in our resource sector.

We all have felt it would be in the service sector. That's where the economists and most people will say we'll grow, in the service sector, and the service sector in the province is about a third of the jobs. But the thing we must remember is that literally half the service sector jobs are in education and health and welfare. If we look at that, we're not going to see substantial growth in that sector.

There is the problem. The solutions are a little more elusive than identifying the problem. Frankly, identifying the problem is comparatively easy. My own view is that the jobs will come from small business, and every economist will tell you that's where the jobs are created, in small business. They will come from us aggressively going after our ability to compete globally. That's a cliché, but I think it's true. I think all of us have all reached that same conclusion. It will come through a lot of the things we talk about: increased training and all of those things.

2100

I would say, though, that I am one who embraces technology and the need for that, but I think we have to be careful of how we respond to it. I'll give you a specific. I think collectively we have let our tourism industry lag, particularly when we get caught up in thinking about technology. We are now into the information era, but I think we make a big mistake by focusing singlemindedly on what we traditionally regard as high-tech areas and ignoring an amazing asset we've got, which is tourism.

Frankly, I was pleased to see the minister's task force. The tourism people were in to see our caucus

about a month ago. I said: "My advice to you is that something the Premier loves is this telecommunications report. He waves that around a lot." That was where you got the various stakeholders and the ministry together and worked out—

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** Gerry, you're not taking credit, I hope.

**Mr Phillips:** I'm not looking for credit, although it would be nice. I said, "My advice is go and wave that report in front of the government and say you want the same thing done in tourism." The Premier is quite caught up in technology and those things, and that's good, the ideas and all that are good, but we make a huge mistake if we singlemindedly go at that and ignore some of our enormously high-potential areas. To me, tourism is one where we can't even stand still. Every country in the world is focusing very heavily on that, because it is job-intensive, it brings in good hard currency, it does all sorts of good things for you. So there's another area. I will use that as an example we must focus on. It's job-intensive, brings in currency, keeps currency in the country, in our province. You can look at other countries, at how they've developed enormous destinations.

I wanted to focus on what for me is the most important problem facing the province. I don't mean to say that our finances aren't important, but for me how we are going to create an environment where jobs are going to be created is important.

Whenever we get talking about this, I think the old-style politics come in and people say, "How much money do we have to spend to create these jobs?" We make a big mistake if we start thinking that. Even when I raise a question in the Legislature around jobs, I'm asking, "How do we create the environment where individuals will create jobs?" not where we will go out and spend money to buy jobs. We've got to get that mindset.

I'm not one who accepts that it is inevitable that we are going to lose much of our manufacturing base. I happen to think, by the way, that we made a huge mistake 15 years ago, when we said: "The smokestack industries are gone. We've got to focus on the information industries." I think what we should have said then was: "The smokestacks are gone from the industries. We have to focus on helping the industries adapt modern technology."

I can remember back 10 to 15 years ago when many people were encouraging their children: "Manufacturing's gone. We're into the information era"—whatever the information era is; I've never figured that one out. But my own view, as I said, is that we should have said, "The smokestacks are gone from the industries." Now I think we're paying the price. Some of our most treasured assets are—drive by a factory where you've

got a vibrant business with 200, 300 or 400 really good jobs. That is an incredible asset to a community, unbelievable: 400 long-term, quality jobs, often where you've got high technology able to create good-paying jobs, and every one of them's a jewel. I think we have lost an awful lot of them.

Free trade: I know as soon as you mention free trade, one party says it's great and the other party says that's the cause of all our problems. We get into this sort of, "Blame everybody." I think the one thing that everyone can agree on—well, I hope there are two things we can all agree on.

I think the government members would agree to this: that we have to become a global trading nation. If you don't accept that, we should have a debate around that, but I don't think that's an option for us. We have to become a global trading nation.

The second thing is that we could not have implemented the free trade agreement under worse conditions. For that, I do fault the people who brought it in, because the people who were negatively impacted by it I think were done an enormous disservice.

What do I mean? The free trade agreement came in. We had at the time it came in a 77-cent or a 78-cent dollar, in that range. It went up to 88 cents, and just at the same time that happened, interest rates rose dramatically. Whatever opportunities were there for our manufacturing sector to take advantage of with free trade, we essentially put the handcuffs on them. We essentially raised their prices 10%. By the way, labour often gets blamed: "Well, labour costs went way up." One reason labour costs went up was that the Canadian dollar rose and, automatically, labour costs versus the US went up 10%. The point I'm making is that we've had a strong negative impact as a result of the free trade agreement and we have lost a lot of jobs.

So the first thing I wanted to say in dealing with this is that I think there's far too little discussion about jobs going on because the government is singlemindedly focused on dealing with its fiscal situation. I guess I can understand that, but I don't accept it.

I keep the little speeches the Premier gives. It was in September 1991: The House came back and the Premier gave what I call his finger-pointing speech, when he said "No more finger-pointing," and then later in question period he started pointing the finger. But it was, "Our number one focus is going to be on jobs." Many of the members may recall that speech in September 1991. Every major speech we've had from the Premier is, "Our number one focus will be on jobs," but if you look at where the energies of the Premier have been spent, I think a fairminded person would say they have not been on jobs. That has not been where the Premier has chosen to put his energies and his time.

The Premier spent a lot of time dealing with the

Constitution, and that's an issue that is important. It's an issue that I wish we could have reached a successful conclusion on. The Premier exerted an enormous amount of his personal time, his energy, his enthusiasm, and in the end it was a valiant effort that just was not able to come to a successful conclusion.

The Premier now is focused very much on the deficit and wrestling it to the ground. I remember in February, for those of us on the finance committee, the Finance minister came in and laid out the finances for us and said: "The deficit's going to be around \$14 billion. Here are all the numbers." He worked very hard on them, so I was really surprised when, about five weeks later, nothing else had changed but the Premier had concluded that the deficit now was \$17 billion and we were into an all-out war to wrestle this one to the ground.

2110

Even here in the Legislature you can see that the energies of the Legislature, I dare say the energies of most of the cabinet, are on the social contract and wrestling with the deficit. In the meantime, my own feeling is that—in fact I was struck today on the job situation. The Treasurer brought quite a comprehensive report to the finance and economics committee on the economic outlook, on the budget and what not.

In the budget which was presented on May 19 it said 98,000 jobs have been created in Ontario in the last eight months. Today, one month later, it's now 85,000 jobs that have been created in the last nine months in Ontario. My point is that we have been hoping and expecting that the number of employed and the number of jobs was going to get better and better and better, but it looks like it's stalled somehow or other.

So I think we're going to have to learn to deal with a couple of issues at the same time here. We must wrestle with our fiscal situation, but I think the Legislature's going to have to turn its attention very, very heavily to the whole issue of how we are going to deal with this, because essentially what the Minister of Finance said today was: "I'm sorry. That's how it's going to be. To the best of our ability, looking at all of the plans that we have, that's how it's going to be."

I'm not sure any of us will find that acceptable. I'm not sure any of us are prepared to live with that, prepared to live with unemployment at 13% through 1995. Youth unemployment, no doubt, will be running above 20%. It is now and, with those numbers, it will continue. That will be unacceptable.

I want to share that with the Legislature because I don't mean in any way to say that what we're dealing with on the fiscal side isn't extremely important and, by the way, linked to jobs. I understand that. I think if we were not dealing with our fiscal situation, we would not be able to solve the employment situation because there's no doubt that, to use the old cliché, capital is very, very easily travelled these days.



People who will create the kind of job situation we want in the future—and it isn't just money, I think it's intellectual capital. The real thing we need here is—

**Mr Callahan:** Talent.

**Mr Phillips:** My colleague said "talent," and enthusiasm and commitment. There are thousands of people out in Ontario with good ideas and we need to create the environment where they're prepared to invest in the idea and often invest financially. That takes an environment.

My background is business. I ran one company and I started up two companies from scratch and it's never easy. You literally put your house on the line. I can remember one day the bank phoning to say, "You better come and re-sign this mortgage or we won't meet your payroll." Those are the sorts of situations you get into and I don't think—you talk to any successful business person who started a business up, I'll bet you nine out of 10, or nine out 100, will say, "If I knew then what I know now, I wouldn't have done it," because they go through an enormously difficult period of time to get it rolling.

My point is this: We do need to have the right fiscal climate for that to happen, so we need to deal with it. There's no doubt about that. But I hope all of us really begin to turn our attention to the job side of it.

How did we arrive at the fiscal situation we're in? I'm never one to say it's all one group's fault. I think there can be no doubt that we've gone through a world recession. There's no doubt that Ontario has been impacted by all of the restructuring—and, by the way, the word "restructuring," I think that's misused as well. Some people say we are going through a period of restructuring. My own judgement is that we are now into constant restructuring, that the thought that restructuring would end and we would go back to some period of normalcy—I think we're into constant change, which, by the way, throws out a new set of problems for us.

Many of us have had at least the comfort of a workplace where we are going to be for a considerable period of time and that provided an environment where we had some comfort. Many, many of us are going to see many job changes in our life. I know everybody says that, and actually I think it's true. So how do we help to add some stability to our communities when we take away, in my respects, the stability that the work environment provided in the past? That's an aside, but it's part of my own belief that we're not into a period where the restructuring will end and we'll be back to normalcy. I think we're into constant change.

But back to how we got here. I hope I don't sound overly partisan. If there's one event that was more responsible than any, I think it was the first budget by the government. I don't think any of the government members could ever say this, but I do believe that in

their quiet moments they would acknowledge that if they could turn the clock back to that first budget, trying to spend one's way out of the recession has proven to be a mistake. It just didn't work, and once you build those costs in, they are very tough to extract.

Now we're wrestling with that, and in the very few moments remaining to me I would say that the social contract is an enormous experiment. I put out something called the Treasury Watch, which is just my comments on things in the treasury, and I said back on May 26 on the issue of the social contract that:

"The \$2-billion-a-year social contract expenditure reductions have been built into the financial plan without assurances it will be realized. This is of course a very challenging experiment for the government and everyone hopes it will be successful. It's the cornerstone of the 1993-94 financial picture and indeed all future financial plans."

I would say to the government that once—I mean, we're in the middle of a debate on this thing, and I know you cannot acknowledge that you have reservations about it, but I think that perhaps when we have another debate in the fall, then time will have told the tale and you can say, "Well, I remember, Mr Phillips, you got up and said you didn't think it would work and we've proven it would work."

I'll go back to what I said in response to one of the member's comments, that I believe what should have happened from the outset was for the government to give its clear guidelines on the financial picture and then let the employees and the employers bargain the resolution themselves.

What we've got now I think is the worst of all worlds, which is sectoral agreements which impact on local agreements and then a minister who has the final authority to approve any plan. The NDP might like that right now, but I'm sure if you were on this side of the House and it was a government of another stripe, you would find it totally unacceptable that a political body would have the authority to have the final say on 9,000 collective agreements in the province, and not just one shot; this runs for three years.

The chamber of commerce no doubt is patting you all on the back right now and saying, "Go get it; it's a great job." but that's a very significant step. It's complicated and it has, literally, unprecedented powers, and I would have hoped they might have found a solution that would have been true collective bargaining where we wouldn't be interfering.

I will conclude because my time is up, and I appreciate the chance to debate this supply motion.

2120

**Hon Richard Allen (Minister without Portfolio in Economic Development and Trade):** I want to compliment the member on an unusually reflective set

of comments in the remarks that he made. I think all of us do agree that his sense of the economic change that is swirling about us is not just a passing phenomenon, that restructuring is a word that is not a phase. It's an ongoing circumstance that is driven by the pace of technological change of our time, and that is impacting dramatically on working relationships, upon the relationships of economies and of all peoples. It's a very dramatic phenomenon which is very potent in terms of our destiny.

I would suggest to him that when we look back from our current fiscal situation to the first budget and the first year in power, there indeed are those of us who do not regret the first budget. There was nothing improper in terms of the classical economics of our times in attempting to move some further public sector spending into the economy in order to maintain employment in some sectors, in order to enhance job opportunities, in order to stimulate the economy to some degree.

I don't think there were any of us who at that point in time thought we were spending our way out of the recession. I don't remember hearing that language around the cabinet table. I don't remember hearing it in government. The language was that we were trying to do something to maintain the economy in a number of ways that we thought were helpful, and I think were helpful. But there is a limit to debt and at some point one has to recognize that, and I think we recognized there would be a limit to debt and that is where we are now, trying to deal with that issue.

Again, compliments to the speaker. I thought it was a very reflective and helpful statement.

**Mr Callahan:** I picked up on one of the comments my colleague made in his speech and it's about young people. Young people are asked to invest their capital, their time, their energies in earning higher education. I think it's reflected in a letter from one of my constituents, a Maria Greifeneder. I hope I haven't ruined her name. She talks about it as "fleeing Ontario."

Is this what we have done? Is this what we, collectively, as the government of Ontario, are about to do, to make young people flee this province? Are we in fact going to pay for educating these young people, are we going to squander their efforts, their time, their energies and let them go to another jurisdiction to find a job? Yet that's in fact what we've done. As my colleague said, it's not just capital that flees this province when you have oppressive taxes, when you have oppressive steps taken in terms of labour legislation; in fact it is young people.

I have great concern about the young people of this province, particularly this summer. I saw last year they were going around selling chocolate bars at doors. I'd never seen that in the province of Ontario before, and that's a very devastating, a very humiliating and a somewhat depressing scenario, because I really don't

see these young people seeing a future for themselves in the province of Ontario.

I think if there's anything we as legislators have a responsibility to pass on to our young people it is the fact, yes, work hard. We will provide the institutions for you. We will make them available to you. We will make jobs available so you can work to pay for them, but when all is said and done and you've got your education, you put in this effort, there will be jobs here for you in the province other than serving hamburgers at McDonald's. I really find that very depressing. I apologize to McDonald's. It's probably a novel job.

**Mr Turnbull:** I must confess that I almost always enjoy the debate which is joined by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt. He brings a lot of very useful points to bear and he has a thoughtful analysis of the economy of Ontario. Indeed, I will be debating immediately after him and I hope I can bring forward the same constructive type of tone. I think it behooves us all to reflect on what he has said and what has been said here tonight.

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** I feel moved to comment on the member for Scarborough-Agincourt's comments, partly because of the comments made by my colleague the member for Hamilton West, but also by the member for Brampton South. I would think the member for Scarborough-Agincourt would prefer not to have commented on his very sensitive discussion, I thought, of the issues that face us. After all, the member for Brampton South probably never answers his own door. Those of us who do answer the door know that people have sold chocolate bars for a long time door to door. It's nothing new.

The fact is that as the member for Scarborough-Agincourt mentioned, there is a constant restructuring going on. It just so happens that before the member for Scarborough-Agincourt rose, I was reading a book called *To Preserve and Defend: Essays on Kingston in the 19th Century*. The point is made that Kingston in the 19th century looked much different from Kingston as it is now. So the same kind of restructuring was occurring then, slower, but it was occurring. People had to address the needs.

A lot of those people came from Great Britain, where obviously changes there meant that the number of people couldn't live in a way that was sustainable, so they had to go to other countries in the world. These kinds of changes are always happening. What we're trying to do is create the circumstances where people can live a decent life in the place where they're born and where they would prefer to live.

Let me mention some of those factors in 19th century Kingston that affected the economy. I must say that the author says: "...factors over which Kingston merchants had no control. These factors are British imperial trade



policy, technological innovation and the shifting balance in North American intercity commercial rivalry," things that face us today. Substitute American or Far East imperial trade policy. That affects us.

The member said it's a global economy we face now and it's the kind of changes that we make. We include, as he said, the ideas of all our citizens in meeting these challenges.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Phillips:** I appreciate the comments of the members and I appreciate the last comment the member from Kingston made. I keep thinking to myself as we look at this unemployment situation that I'm sure legislators stood around 100 years ago when machinery was being invented and said, "Gosh, we're going to have 90% of our farm community unemployed." But we somehow or other worked our way through it. Each time, we've worked our way through it.

That's the optimistic side of me. It says, "Listen, I'm not sure what the solution is to these unemployment rates, but we'll find it," and I'm sure we will, but it will not happen by accident, I guess is my belief, and it may not be as easily come by perhaps as it has been in the past.

The member from Hamilton mentions that he's very proud of the budget. I recall the first budget's words to this effect, "We could have fought the deficit or we could have fought the recession, and we're fighting the recession." I think I'm accurately paraphrasing it. I go back to the point I made earlier that we may have to learn to do more than one thing around here at once.

It's tough to have a debate around here, because it's impossible. I once asked the Treasurer, "If you look back now, Treasurer, on that budget, would you acknowledge you were mistaken?" He said: "You want a headline that says 'Treasurer Admits He Made a Mistake'?" You can't do it. I'm saying that I do think the focus on fighting the recession, the thought of spending our way out of the recession that was there, that was a hallmark of that budget, was a mistake in the area of spending more than should have been spent.

2130

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Turnbull:** As I came here tonight, I had been out briefly to present a scroll at a school in my riding. I came back and I went to our caucus room, and I ate a piece of pizza while I watched the debate of Mr Mahoney, the member for Mississauga West. I thought that was an excellent speech in which he reflected on many of the problems that we have in this House, and I determined then that the frankly fairly partisan speech that I had intended to deliver was not what I wanted to do. I wanted to get on the record some of the concerns

and some of the solutions that I would personally put forward to this government and, in fact, any government.

First of all, I must for the record point out that it is disappointing that I haven't been able to have any input on the budget. Just to go back to the history of the budget, we had a pre-budget consultation period in which our party put forward a document with a great deal of detail, in which we put forward 15 points where we suggested the government could become more efficient and could save the taxpayers money and alleviate the need for tax increases.

The budget was brought in on a Wednesday immediately before a constituency week, and on the Thursday, the leaders of the two opposition parties were allowed to join the debate. Then one week later, on the Monday, we were given one further day of debate; we had one rotation. It means that our party has had two speakers; our leader and one other speaker have debated the budget. So before I start offering the solutions that I believe would help to eradicate some of the problems we face in this economy today, I must point out that I believe very sincerely that some of our democratic rights are being eroded, Mr Speaker, and I know that you have been very concerned about the conduct of Parliament and the relevancy of opposition members and backbenchers.

I would suggest that given that I'm given to believe there are only two official debates which are considered to be without any doubt a matter of confidence—that is, the throne speech and the budget—and the fact that the government has not brought this forward for debate and for a vote on the budget, I have not had my right as a duly elected member of this Legislature to express the displeasure that my constituents, the people of York Mills, feel for the budget.

The post-budget consultation that my party involved itself in was quite extensive. We had members who travelled the whole province and spoke to chambers of commerce, to union leaders, to people on the street, and they gave us their concerns and we undertook to bring them back to this Legislature. We weren't allowed to do that. I think there is a fundamental problem with the way our House is working when that happens.

Let me just talk a little bit about the situation we find ourselves in. There's no doubt that the spending of this province is out of control. Last year, we had the second highest revenues in provincial history, and that is something worth reflecting on. Notwithstanding the fact that the government has told us it has this terrible revenue problem, it had the second highest revenues in history.

What we have is an expenditure problem, not a revenue problem. All governments, of all political stripes, have added to the debt of this province, but none more so than the present government. The problem

we have now is that we have a budget which calls for expenditures in excess of \$10 billion by way of deficit financing. The government would have you believe it's less than \$10 billion, and yet if you read the fine italics at the bottom of their own budget pages, you will find a note which suggests that \$805 million is in fact taken off book into crown corporations, which is nevertheless debt that this province is responsible for.

In addition to that there will be \$600 million which will be borrowed by schools. Instead of going to the old grant system that the education authorities got from the government, this government has moved to a system where it's saying, "Okay, school boards have borrowing power that the government apparently doesn't feel it has. We will have them borrow the money and in turn the government will service the debt," that is, \$600 million. By any measure, according to any accountant I have spoken to, this is debt. The deficit of this province this year will be significantly in excess of \$10 billion, even though we were told it was less than \$10 billion.

The great problem we have with the growing debt is that the approximately \$10 billion worth of bonds which were floated by the government at the beginning of this year were not fully taken up by the public. There is a concern about the quality of our bonds, and so many of the issuing agencies, the banks and so forth, are holding these in their treasury. That is a very serious problem for this government, because its ability to roll over debt as it comes due is severely limited if not totally blocked by the fact that those bonds are in the treasuries of the issuing organizations and therefore we will not be able to go out with any further debt.

We have an unemployment rate which is rather alarming. That is not, in and of itself, entirely the fault of this government. We have a very serious world recession going on. My friends on the other side of the floor would have us believe that is somehow due to free trade, and yet we know that free trade is not responsible for the job losses in Germany, the job losses in England, the job losses in France and even the job losses in Switzerland. Switzerland, which has historically had an unemployment rate which was measured in the decimal points has now a 5.5% unemployment rate.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** The US has lost three times more than we have.

**Mr Turnbull:** The US has lost a huge number of jobs. Yes, indeed, free trade has caused some job losses, but mainly it is the restructuring and the world recession which have caused the problems. In fact, the one bright light on our economic horizon has been the trade with the US, because since free trade we have in fact increased our exports to the US. They are now at record levels.

But let us turn to the solutions which I would suggest the government should consider very seriously. Presum-

ably, at some point in the summer we will get away for a holiday. Who knows? Maybe not. But I would like them to at least go away and consider the possibility of adopting these measures.

I think we should move to set up an office of the comptroller general. The comptroller general should be completely independent of all political parties. The appointment should be made in consultation between the three leaders of the political parties and with the broadest possible consultation with the private sector, accountants and so forth. The job of the comptroller general would be to oversee and approve expenditures before the government gets into them. Unlike the Auditor General, who can only examine what has gone wrong in the past and blow the whistle on it, this would be a way that the government would be able to understand the effects of any program it's about to go into.

If you think back to the late 1970s, the Auditor General of Canada at the time recommended the appointment of a comptroller general. This was under the Liberal government of Pierre Trudeau. Their expenditures were out of control and so the Auditor General said this would be a way of handling it.

2140

I remember speaking to the man who was appointed as comptroller general on the day that he was appointed. He was a vice-president of Xerox and he was not appointed as an independent comptroller general. In fact his appointment was welcomed along with a statement from the minister—I believe it was actually the Prime Minister—and then one of the senior civil servants who briefed him and said: "Your first job is to set up your own personal office. You have an allowance of \$50,000"—now remember, this is the late 1970s—"to buy new furniture for your office." This was not for the whole of the department; this was just for his own personal office, and \$50,000 was an awful lot of money. This new man who was being appointed was shocked, because he saw in this one statement an indication of how seriously he was needed, inasmuch as the government thought in terms of spending big money on everything it did.

If we were to appoint an independent comptroller general, I think all parties, whoever was in power, would have the benefit of some wise counsel to say: "Wait a minute. This might be the conclusion of what you're doing now."

I believe that we should establish a very good econometric model of the Ontario economy. There are about three or four good national econometric models, but we don't have an econometric model of the province, to the best of my knowledge. We certainly don't have one in government. This econometric model should be available to the government at all times. It should also be periodically made available to the opposition parties for them to run and model their ideas. We



should also endeavour to offset the cost of establishing this model by selling the services to the private sector. There are an awful lot of large businesses that would be very interested, I believe, in using this.

One of the advantages in making it available to the opposition as well as the government is that political parties would not just have it available, but they would be required to set out their agenda for the next election and test it with this model, so that we don't get one of these elections where a whole lot of promises are made and then a government comes in and says: "Oh, gee, we find there's no money. We can't afford it." The information would be available to those parties and nobody would have any excuse for buying people's votes with their own money, because the people who cast the vote would be in a position to be able to understand exactly what the implications of these programs that are being proposed would cost.

I believe we need a review of all government programs and we should be considering the original purpose for which the programs were established. For this reason, it is rather important that there be a very clear understanding, when we launch a program, as to why it is being launched so that we can measure with objective criteria how well we are doing with this program. We should be able to measure the cost of it on an ongoing basis and compare it with the projected cost and we should be able to consider on an ongoing basis, are there other ways of delivering those services on a more cost-effective basis, and also in which way we can service our clients better?

Another point which I believe is very important is that we must get to the situation where arbitrators in this province who arbitrate both public and private sector labour disputes have much clearer guidelines as to how they should be considering arbitration awards. There must be consideration for the ability of either the public or the private sector to be able to pay the arbitration award. There must be consideration for the impact on that business or on government, and if that means that there would be a requisite cost in terms of tax increases, we would have to be able to put that plainly forward.

The arbitrators should consider, when they're looking at a sector, and just hypothetically let's take school teachers, rather than just simply looking at school teachers in another municipality, they should also be looking at the amount of education that is required and the amount of stress that is inherent in that job as compared with another parallel job, so that we don't get sectors of our economy which are vastly out of step with others.

I remember seeing the Premier, Bob Rae, quite agitated when there was an arbitrator's award, I believe it was for the TTC, coming out. He thought that it was wrong. Yet here we have a perfect example of how an

arbitrator is so independent and does not have to take consideration of the economic realities we're in.

I believe that we must move to change the committee system within our government. The present government—and I'm not just talking about the governing party; I'm talking about the whole Legislature—doesn't work terribly well. It is apparent to all members who arrive here. During their first term at a certain point they hit themselves on the head and they say, "Gosh, this is crazy." What are we doing? Why are we playing these games? We must be governing for the betterment of the people of Ontario, not for a small number of people who may be our partisans. We must seek to reduce the size of government.

Indeed my colleague the member for Simcoe West reflected on the fact that the last Conservative government reduced the size of the civil service by several thousand people over a period of years without any job cuts. They used simply guidelines that said, "We should not be increasing the size of government; we must reduce." In this, it was done simply by attrition.

We have got to stop unwise spending. A perfect example of this, and this is where I know the government will disagree with me, but the present expenditures on non-profit housing, which are projected to grow by 1995 to \$1.5 billion, are absolutely unsustainable, particularly given that there are plans within your own Housing ministry which suggest that shelter allowances could be provided to those same people, those same target people, particularly the working poor, for much less money and would have a much broader application so that we could help more people. Rather than the small target that we're hitting at the moment with very costly housing, we would be able to help a much broader section.

We absolutely have got to stop abuses of the public purse, like spending \$50,000 to develop a new union song or spending \$30,000 to send 20 union members on a course on humour. Now, I must say, I am absolutely convinced that had I been around this House when we were in government or when the Liberals were in government, I could cite examples of where we have made stupid expenditures and where the Liberals have made stupid expenditures. But let us please get to reality and admit that it is a stupid waste of taxpayers' money. Having said that, let's move to having a more reasonable approach and a more fiscally responsible consideration for the taxpayer.

We must move to having greater concentration on the high-tech industries. I applaud the fact that the Premier has invited various members of the opposition parties to sit on panels of the Premier's Council to advise him. That is a step in the right direction, which has never been made by governments before. The present Premier's Council was established by the Peterson government and continued by the Premier, and some of the



council members are still there from the Peterson days; not many but a few. This is a reasonable way that we should be planning the future, so that no matter which party comes into power, we are all a party to the very difficult situation we find in the world today.

2150

We must move to have a system which rewards the employees of the government for finding efficiencies, much in the way private business rewards its employees. The most successful businesses are the ones that have found ways of rewarding their employees, and often the private businesses that do not succeed have not found that way. In the same vein, we must move to have exactly the same type of regime in government. We must have a tax structure which rewards rather than penalizes the entrepreneurs who create jobs.

In a very curious discussion I had a few weeks ago, at the time that we were out consulting just after the budget—by and large, we had terrific response from the public—I came across one man who was a lifetime socialist. He was rather annoyed at the fact that we were having the audacity to say that taxes were too high. He said, “No, I think taxes should go up more.” I said, “Oh, do you want to pay more taxes?” His answer was, “No, no. It’s those fat-cat business people.”

He was utterly convinced that they should be paying more taxes, absolutely ignoring the fact that there were a lot of businesses which are going out of business or are leaving the country. I pointed out to him at that time that even if he considered they were paying too little in taxes, if they find a more friendly regime today, jobs, and particularly ideas, are very portable. If we lose that intellectual depth, we will lose the jobs and we will lose the race to keep our standard of living.

I’m alarmed by the number of my constituents who are talking about leaving this province to go to other provinces or to the United States. As most of the members in this House know, I have an unusually affluent riding, but I have a lot of people who are in Ontario Housing who are not affluent. We need to keep the affluent people who are the job creators so that we can continue to have a high standard of living for all Ontarians.

The number of conversations I’ve had with entrepreneurs, doctors, surgeons, scientists and computer consultants who have already applied for their green card is alarming. My answer is, “Please stick around and fight to change the way we are so that we can once again move forward, so that our children can enjoy the standard of living we have.”

These are just a few of my thoughts that I’ve presented, I think probably in a much quieter tone than I typically debate in here, and I would ask the members of the government to go away and consider the thoughts I’ve put forward to you. They’re not particularly partisan. Consider them and think about implementing

them, because I think all of Ontario would be a better place for it and our children will thank us for it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mr Callahan:** To the relief of the House, and I suppose the relief of my wife, who tells me I—

**Mr Stockwell:** This is questions and comments.

**Mr Callahan:** I thought it was further debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member addressed some of the major issues. Speaking about interim supply, I thought it was rather important that he speak about financial issues that arise when you borrow or spend billions and billions and billions of taxpayers’ dollars.

The member for York Mills has, in my estimation, spent a significant amount of time reviewing this budget and he does give it much consideration, as we hear every day and every Tuesday in caucus. He has spent the time investigating the expenditures and the controls that he feels need to be put in place to bring this deficit under control.

It seems to me that in his comments tonight, some of the points he made were extremely poignant. They are points that I think any government today or in the future will have to address in a far more significant fashion than they have in the past. It seems that governments have gone about spending money and taxing constituents with not much thought about the redress they face at the ballot box. Those days are long gone.

I travel this province, and I know the member for York Mills does. As he travels the province, the number one issue you hear about today is deficits, taxes and government spending. There’s no longer a sacred program, as we’ve seen. Even the NDP itself has started putting in user fees for the health care system. The health care system is no longer a sacred cow. Social services are no longer a sacred cow. It seems such a distant memory that back in 1990 this government on the campaign trail said it would eradicate food banks. That seems like a lifetime ago, another century, when that promise was made, but it was just three short years ago.

I would like to compliment the member for York Mills. He has put long thought into this, and I appreciate his comments. If the government were truly looking for ways of seeing how it could save taxpayers’ money, the first person I’d talk to is the member for York Mills.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** I promised the member for York Mills that if he gave a good speech I would get up and say something. I think the member for Mississauga West started something tonight in an attempt to correct some of the difficult scenes we had here last evening. What I want to say to the member for York Mills is that I appreciated the style of this delivery. I believe he has the reputation of being fairly partisan and hard-hitting when he gives his address in this House, but this evening he took a reasonable approach. He made some



good points—not many that I agree with, I might add—but he made them in a very serious way. I know he believes very strongly in them.

One point I would like to comment on, though, is that he said we have a spending problem and not a revenue problem. That is not completely accurate. There are difficulties on both sides. We have to meet the needs of people who have special needs in this province. There's a need to increase social assistance, for example, for those who are most vulnerable. It's important that we meet their needs with taxpayer dollars. We do, however, have a revenue problem as well. Our revenues are down by more than \$1 billion over the last couple of years. We have to make up that shortfall either through taxation or through borrowing, and we've tried to have a balanced approach. I think the member should look at all sides of the issue and not be single-minded and simply talk about expenditures as we look at our overall fiscal situation.

However, I think we should compliment the member. It's one of the first times I've seen him give an address in here which was fairly straightforward and rational, and I appreciate his different tenor this evening.

**Mr Callahan:** I wasn't going to take the two minutes because I'm sure everybody is tired and wants to get home, but I'm going to use it to add to my 30 minutes because I wanted to address the question of small business development loans.

The Minister of Labour, I have always found over the years I have been in the Legislature with him, is a man who is terribly concerned about jobs. I have two instances—which I hope his colleagues will relate to him, and I will get the material to him—that occurred in my riding.

One of them was Panther Systems of Canada. The other was an individual by the name of Mr William A. Bravin. Both attempted to access funds to create jobs in my community through a small business development corporation. Both of them went to extreme effort in trying to gather the capital they required in order to gather the money from the government to get the jobs going. But because of the cuts, the small business development loans were cancelled. The net result was a loss of about 125 to 130 jobs in my community. That impacts on the cost of government because, obviously, when these people are not employed, it means they collect unemployment insurance and, as we all know, there's a single taxpayer in this country. I'm going to be giving these to the Minister of Labour and I hope he would give serious consideration to them.

2200

Small business accounts for about 80% of our jobs. With respect, I suggest it was unwise to have done one of two things: number one, to have gotten rid of small business development loans, but more importantly, to have cut them off at the pass and not given those who

were already in the system the opportunity to complete the capitalization. What it did in my community, as I said, is that it lost us 120 to 140 jobs. We can't afford to lose those.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I want to really congratulate my colleague from York Mills for what was excellent participation in the debate this evening. The 10 points he brought forward included such things as:

—Setting up an office of controller general.

—A review of all government programs with respect to their cost, effectiveness and their value to the taxpayers.

—Giving greater direction to arbitrators in terms of ensuring that arbitrators take into account competitiveness in the private and public sectors and also, I think, the employers' ability to pay.

—Change the way government committees work. I thought he spoke from the heart with respect to some of the frustrations members of the opposition and members of the back bench of government feel with regard to committees and their effectiveness, the hours and hours we spend in those committees and whether or not we truly have any effect on how the government conducts its business.

—A reduction in the size of government, particularly through attrition, really simply going back and working on the model established by the former Conservative government in Ontario.

—Controlling spending.

—Concentration on high-tech industries as an industrial strategy for Ontario.

—Rewards to government employees for efficiency. Right now, we see near the end of each government fiscal year what we call the burnoff, where there's a mad dash to spend your budget in case they cut it next year.

—To bring some much-needed tax reform and tax relief to the people of Ontario.

I daresay I miss the former member for York Mills. The metamorphosis we've seen this evening is hard for a partisan person like me to handle. None the less, I'm sure his wife, Cecile, is proud, and his two children, Nicole and Andrew, are very proud to have him as their father, as we are proud to have him as a colleague in this Legislature, particularly on an evening like this when he brought forward such constructive thoughts. I do hope the government takes his suggestions seriously.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for York Mills, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr Turnbull:** It sounded like my swan song, didn't it? No, I'm not resigning.

The comment I would have for the member for Hastings-Peterborough is that he asserts that it is a revenue problem, not a spending problem. I fundamen-

tally refute that. He said welfare was up over \$1 billion. I don't refute that; indeed, to those people who are out of jobs and need welfare we should be offering every possible assistance. It's the other programs you have created, with all due respect, which have caused your spending problem.

You're shaking your head, but I will undertake, if you want to come to my office or if you want me to attend your office, to go line by line through the budget and I will point out the waste which is causing your drastic overspending, your more than \$10-billion deficit which is causing this province, in fact the whole country, to have a serious credit problem. There is a very real potential that this province could be downgraded in its rating. That will have an impact on not only your government but future governments in terms of the cost of borrowing.

I would certainly thank my colleagues. I also have to apologize to my assistant Charis Kelso, who is sitting in the gallery, who laboured today to produce the speech which I didn't give. But I've enjoyed this debate and I do hope, once again, that the members will consider these potential savings and go home and consider them.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr Callahan:** I would like to have said that this speech will be shorter than 30 minutes, because I'm sure everybody's tired, including the people who are perhaps not paid as handsomely as the people in this Legislature, but I have to rise to speak to three issues.

One of them I've already addressed in the two-minute speech. I hope my constituents will be happy with that, and I intend to take their concerns to the Minister of Labour. That was over the Small Business Development Corporations Act, the opportunities being cancelled under the act due to the cuts that were required because of our financial situation. I hope they will be satisfied with that, because I do intend to take them to the Minister of Labour. I'm sure all members of the House are honourable people, and I think all members of the House wish to see jobs prosper and satisfied. Hopefully, we can get that back on the track.

One thing I do want to address tonight is something that's concerned me since I was elected to the Legislature in 1985. I note today, which is very interesting, in the *Toronto Star*, Thursday, June 24, 1993, there is a headline that says: "'All-Out War' Planned On Schizophrenia." If I could, without being pejorative, get the attention of my colleagues over there, this article is rather interesting. It's an article that says schizophrenia is a disease that costs Canadians an estimated \$4 billion a year. It affects 270,000 Canadians—I hope we're all listening. Mr Speaker, I'm going to sit down until I can get the attention of my colleagues.

**The Speaker:** Order. There are a number of private conversations. The member for Brampton South has

been recognized on the floor, and perhaps private conversations could occur outside of the chamber.

**Mr Callahan:** The reason I asked for that attention is not for me, but what I'm trying to say to you is that schizophrenia is a disease that affects 270,000 Canadians. It costs Canadians an estimated \$4 billion a year. We're concerned about the question of cutting costs, of paring down costs because of the tremendous deficit we have in this province. Schizophrenics "occupy 8% of Canadian hospital beds"—think of the cost of that—"and cost the health care system \$2.3 billion a year." The problem is—

**Mr Stockwell:** A point of order, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Callahan:** I would appreciate it if we didn't call a quorum call.

**The Speaker:** The member for Brampton South.

**Mr Callahan:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that my colleague didn't call the quorum call.

The concern I've got, to put a real face on the situation, is that the amount of money spent in finding a cure for schizophrenia is \$4 million a year. With any other disease, heart disease, cancer, whatever, eight times that is spent. With the small amount of money that the schizophrenia researchers have had, they have been able to find, in a short period of time, not just the cause of schizophrenia in locating the gene, but at the same time they have located the gene for Parkinson's disease. They're mirror images of one another. One is too much dopamine and the other one is too little dopamine.

Think of what would happen if we took the amount of money, the \$4 billion a year that we spend on schizophrenics, the hospital beds that are occupied, and we took that money and the government invested that in research to increase, at least to the extent of research there is in other areas, the combined efforts in terms of finding a cure for this disease.

Let me put a real face on it. People who come to Toronto from outside—and I include myself from Brampton—see the poor souls who are wandering the streets of this city whom we all sort of just cast aside and ignore as being weirdos, the people we find sleeping up against the grates at the YMCA during the cold winters because they haven't got a place to sleep, the people we see begging, the people we see sleeping on park benches, the homeless, the people I think we all care for or should care for. Many of those people are schizophrenics. I remember that one politician—I can't remember who he was—made the comment that these people want to do that because that's their lifestyle. Well, I suggest to you it's not their lifestyle.

2210

Let me say as legislators we made one very serious mistake in 1985 or 1986 when we amended the Mental Health Act. We let these people slide right through the



cracks. We have a system that is a revolving-door system for the most tragic event of human kind, and I'm sorry to say that it exists in Ontario or Canada. We have a system that allows people to be picked up off the street and made involuntary patients only if they are a danger to themselves or to society.

The net result is they're picked up because they are a danger to themselves or society, they're taken into the hospital, they go before a board and that board declares that they're in need of treatment, they get the treatment and then they go before an appeal board that says, "You no longer need treatment," and they're ushered out the back door back on to the streets.

Now, the Attorney General should be very interested in this, because I have had judges in the courts where cases have been brought before the courts and in fact they've been schizophrenics who have committed a crime and the judges have told me, they said, "This is not a problem for the justice system, this is a health problem."

Back in the days of the Davis government and after, it was thought to be humane to let all of these people out of the institutions back out on the streets. Well, it probably was. But if we don't provide the backup for them and if we don't provide the research money to try and find a cure for this terrible disease—and I'm sure I could go through the 130 members of the Legislature and I would find that each and every one of you has someone who has touched you in your lives who has schizophrenia and you would dearly like to be able to help, and that's why this is so important.

You could say that in standing up here I'm asking the government in a time of bad economic times to spend more money. I'm not. I'm asking you, I'm asking the Minister of Health, who unfortunately is not here, but I'm asking you as cabinet colleagues to bring this to her attention, that in fact you have an opportunity to strike, to put an iron in the fire to help people who are costing us—forget about the human side of it—\$4 billion a year.

Now, \$4 billion a year would allow Floyd Laughren to not have to negotiate the social contract, would not have to disrupt the lives of all those people who are going to lose their jobs or have to take time off from work, would allow the Minister of Labour to carry on as the honourable man he has always been in the years I've known him in terms of being able to tell the unions, "All right, your jobs are secure." That \$4 billion would be there. All we'd have to do is take a billion of that, or even less, and redirect it into investigating a cure for this, and we would have the money to deal with Mr Laughren's problem as well as dealing with this very sad problem of people who are involved.

Let me give you an example of what happens to a schizophrenic, and I hope by doing this I'm not revealing any type of a conflict in terms of my professional

career. Take an individual who does something very bizarre and as a result the police are called. The police come to the scene to try to deal with the situation and one of the policemen is hurt in the course of doing it.

Normally when policemen are hurt in our courts, they deal them a very serious blow in terms of it being a jail term, and it makes sense. These people have to be protected. They're the people who put their lives on the line every day to protect us. Yet what happens is, the minute you try to put your defendant into the witness box to try to defend himself or herself by saying, "The television set told me to do it," the crown attorney stands up and says, "Well, this person is insane, so we're going to send this person off to Penetang," and the person will be there at the pleasure of the Lieutenant Governor.

The net result is, these people who are actually innocent—this has been caused by an illness—are required to plead guilty, even though they're not guilty, and suffer some other penalty.

Mr Speaker, I really find this objectionable. Doesn't anybody care about schizophrenia? Do we have to have 3,000 conversations in this place? I think it's a very important issue and I wish the people would stop their conversations, and I ask you, Speaker, to intervene.

**The Speaker:** The member for Brampton South makes a valid point that indeed there are a number of private conversations, which more appropriately should be held outside of the chamber, and the member for Brampton South has the floor.

**Mr Perruzza:** Get him to be a little more exciting, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Callahan:** I do find that last comment absolutely abominable, Mr Speaker. Maybe you should become schizophrenic and maybe you'd understand it, okay? You've got about as much sensitivity as a rat. Oh, I'm sorry—

**The Speaker:** The member for Brampton South will know that his comment is not parliamentary. The member for Downsview is completely out of order.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** No one's listening anyway.

**Mr Callahan:** I don't know whether the Minister of Labour said that, but he said, "Nobody's listening anyway." I find that really insensitive too, Minister of Labour. I intended to do the last speech in this House on a high note, but you've made it very difficult to do that. I'm sure that the people out there who have schizophrenic children are certainly not complimented by the fact that you made that statement and another one of your colleagues made an insensitive statement as well.

Maybe I'm wasting my time trying to talk to a government that's looking for ways to save money. If you're looking for ways to save money and to solve the problems of the people in this province, the young

people, then for God's sake, wake up and do it. Don't sit over there and make insensitive comments about people who have schizophrenia and it's not their fault.

Try to take some positive efforts. You're always looking for positive reasons; you want positive suggestions from this side of the House. The time that's given to you on a sensitive issue, what do you do? You chuckle and you talk, you make comments like were made by the member from—wherever. I'm not even going to look it up.

Now I'm suggesting to you and I'm asking you, I'm pleading with you: You are the government of the day. You have an opportunity to use the money wisely instead of unwisely. Instead of incarcerating these people, why don't you direct the money in a way that it can be used to solve the problem?

*Interjection.*

**Mr Callahan:** It's obvious, Mr Speaker, I'm sorry to say, that this does not seem to be turning anybody on, but you should be. You should thank God that your children are not schizophrenic. I have six close friends who have schizophrenic children. Their children are wandering the streets tonight perhaps and they're wondering where they are. They love them very dearly.

Believe me, they're not my children, thank God, so this is not a personal situation. It is personal in terms of my fighting for the people I care about and we should all care about, the most vulnerable. We talk in this House very eloquently about protecting the most vulnerable: Give them housing, give them welfare, give them whatever. Yet when it comes time to look at an issue that we can solve, that we can deal with, we turn an insensitive eye.

We say: "Well, it's a quarter after 10 at night. I'm tired. Let's not listen. Let's not do anything about it. Let's consider it to be a minor issue." It's not a minor issue, believe me. So I ask you to consider that with your colleagues.

We ruined it; we ruined the Mental Health Act in 1985, literally. We created a scenario where—and I'm sure that you've been on committees, many of you, before you were in government, where you heard the pleas of parents, "Help us, do something for us. Give us the tools, give us the legislation to try to help," and we didn't do it. Now what I'm asking is for you to redirect funds in terms of investigating a cure for it.

You can save \$4 billion a year. I didn't write that, the Star did. Now maybe they've got their facts all washed up, I don't know, maybe they're wrong. But I suggest it's worth looking at if we can save that kind of money.

If we can avoid 8% of Canadian hospital beds being used by schizophrenics; if we can get into research; if we can take a look at a good start, it would be an extra \$10 million to \$12 million. That's what Dr Jones, who is a research person in this regard, says it would cost us.

So Mr Laughren would not have to even give \$1 billion away. If he gave just a couple of million away, we could have a good shot at trying to cure this problem.

The other thing I want to raise is the question of the government's direction in terms of removing help for the learning-disabled. It's the efforts of this government, this government that says it cares for the people who can't help themselves, to take away the provisions that were in the act, that John Sweeney, who is a man I thought was probably the most noble man ever to serve in this House, fought for. He would not vote for Bill 82 until that was included, and you people are going to take it out with one swipe of a pen. You're going to eliminate it.

You know, learning disability is something you're going to find as you turn around and perhaps have children or look at your children or your nieces and nephews. You're going to discover maybe they have a learning disability, maybe they are kids who cannot be helped in the regular system and by the stroke of the pen, by what you're doing now, you're accomplishing, I suggest, the same injustice that was accomplished in 1985 with the Mental Health Act amendment.

Done in good faith, no question about it. We thought that was, or at least the government of the day—not the government of the day; actually it was the New Democratic Party and the Conservatives—thought that these amendments were appropriate. I won't mention the member's name, but I can understand the reasons he wanted these in. But in fact what happened, and he admitted it afterwards when I did my private member's bill, was we went too far. We created a situation that we didn't encompass, we didn't imagine would happen, and we have now created a scenario out there that's a problem.

2220

We're going to do the same thing with the learning-disabled. I don't understand. I spoke to the Minister of Education of the day—it's now changed to someone else—and he indicated to me that the reason they were doing it was because the school boards found it an easy way to ship these kids out if they couldn't find a way to deal with them.

In fact, I suggested to him, why don't you cut half a loaf? Prevent the school boards from doing that by requiring them to pay one half of the cost and the province pays the other half of the cost. Instead, what's happening is the proposal is to get rid of it completely.

It doesn't do any good to be on record as saying, "I told you so," and I don't want to have that benefit of being able to say, "I told you so." But for God's sake, look at it before you decide to do that, because in fact we may be going down the same slippery slope that we went down in terms of schizophrenics.

I have a young person in my riding—I'm going into



another issue—who wrote me, and she made some very positive comments. She was particularly looking at Bill 48, and she's a political science student. As I read through the letter, I couldn't determine whether she was a Liberal, Conservative or New Democrat. It really doesn't matter. She probably has no political affiliation whatsoever. She's a bright person who wrote to me to try to explain her feelings and also wrote to the leader of the third party.

She was incensed that they voted in favour of Bill 48, so that tells me she mustn't be a Conservative. She was not in support of everything we said either, so that tells me she's not a Liberal. She was certainly unhappy with some of the things you're doing, and let me tell you the things she told me.

I think they're very constructive and maybe it will help the Premier, because Bill 48 is something that I'd prefer to see you people achieve through negotiation. I quite frankly would, because the minute you get into legislation, you've got all the problems of the possibilities of challenges in the courts and all that can create.

She raised a couple of points. One of them I hadn't even thought about is the fact that when you set an artificial barrier of \$30,000 and only those people who are above it are subject to this act and the people below are not, you immediately run afoul of subsection 15(1) of the charter. You're not dealing with people equally, and unless you can satisfy the Supreme Court of Canada or some court that in fact section 1 will free you from that being unlawful legislation on the basis that this is something that government can do in a free and democratic society, you're going to find yourself in deep trouble.

If I'm right—and I must admit that I'm wrong more than I'm right, but if I'm right—you have created a scenario where, if you have laid people off, the legislation now protects the government and therefore the taxpayers of Ontario from being sued. But if the legislation is struck down at some point, somewhere along the line this government or the government of the day and therefore the taxpayers of Ontario are going to be subject to very significant lawsuits for wrongful dismissal. The act specifically protects us, but if the act is gone, you're in trouble.

I suggest to you that's something that should be looked at very carefully, and I wish you well. I hope that you can accomplish this through negotiation. I think that's the way it should go. It would certainly make me feel better and I think it would be fairer to the people you're negotiating with. But if you have to go the legislative route, this lady says—and she's not a lawyer; she's a third-year student and she's raised a couple of issues which to me signal red flags that we should be looking at it—we are the guardians of the taxpayers of this province and, whether we're in opposition or we're in government, we have to be certain that what steps we

take are not going to cause more grief, more loss of income, more deficits down the line.

She also raises another very significant issue, the fact that she is a young person who has worked very hard to get educated. She's worked during the summer, she's never accepted any type of handout and she now finds as she gets into third year of university that there's nothing out there for her. She in fact had some very uncomplimentary things to say about Jobs Ontario. She said it was a babysitting service. I don't know whether she's right or wrong in that regard, but it was certainly her comment. She made some suggestions about hiring freezes as opposed to trying to eliminate jobs. She may be right.

I thought it was rather nice that she would take the time, because a lot of people, rather than take the time to write to their members of Parliament and perhaps suggest positive statements, are usually just apathetic. They don't do anything. They're not prepared to say anything. They don't vote in the next election. But this young lady, I congratulate her for having taken the time to do this.

I want to get back to the question of health cuts. It's always been a hallmark of this government, when it was in opposition and we were dealing with the question of extra-billing, it was always the argument that the question of health care should be something between the person and their doctor. That was always the hallmark of the day. In fact, without raising the spectre of abortion, that has always been the argument about abortion, that it should be a question between the woman and her doctor.

Yet here I have a letter from Dr Dickson, who is the new president of the Ontario Medical Association, and the gist of what he's saying is that the government has now stepped in and said it's no longer a question between the doctor and the patient; it's now a question between what the government thinks the patient can have and the patient can't have. Dr Dickson may be wrong, and if he is, I hope you will respond to him.

In fact, for the first time, you've interfaced the government between the doctor and the patient. I find that flies totally in the face of everything that I understand the New Democratic Party has always stood for. I have some friends who are members of the New Democratic Party and they've always told me it's sacrosanct between the doctor and the patient. It's a decision between the patient and the doctor. You can't intervene. You can't interfere. It's not a question of what the result is of the treatment; you don't interfere. Yet here we find that's exactly what's happening.

It's done with an effort to try to protect the universality of our health care, and I can't quarrel with that. Even this young lady, in her letter to me, my constituent, tells me that there are abuses, obviously. There are abuses where people go to the emergency service of the

hospital because their child has a cold, whereas they could have gone to their regular doctor or whatever, or they could have given him some type of remedy. There's no question that there's abuse.

Maybe the answer is that every person in this province should get a listing of how much he's used in health care services over a year, just to draw to his attention the fact that this is what it's costing you. If you really get pressed for taxes, maybe the next step is to say, "If you use over a certain amount, then it's added to your taxable income." That way you maintain the universality of the program, because the people who are poor and in low-income brackets aren't going to pay anything for it, but the people who are in the higher income brackets are going to have to pay for it. Maybe that's the way you protect universality.

But I don't think, and I'm trying to be helpful, that you tell a doctor, if he's seen this patient for an ear infection, let's say, or an eye infection, to say, "You can only come back to me once more and after that I don't want to hear from you again." I don't see any doctor comfortably practising under those circumstances, because he's risking his professional capability. He's also risking his civil liability, because if he can't see the patient again and the patient develops something that's more serious and dies, where do you think they're going to go? They're going to go to the lawyer next and they're going to sue the pants off the doctor.

2230

Maybe you should look at some of those alternatives. I don't think the people of this province—and I've talked to a lot of them—would object to the first part of my suggestion, that they in fact be sent a list of the services they've used in a year, just so we all know that we are—well, it has two purposes. It lets us realize that we're getting something for our tax dollar. Also, as we see the health care system expand and become more costly, it makes us more aware of the fact that if we continue to frivolously go to our doctor or allow the doctor to frivolously bring us back, then we're injuring or perhaps putting in jeopardy the health care system.

I urge you to look at that as opposed to interfering between the services that a doctor can perform. We're not doctors. We should never take on that responsibility. We're legislators. We try hard to do that and I think we do the best job we can, but let's not interfere with the health care system in the way that's being suggested. I think the doctors would find that most acceptable. It might be something you could try on them.

I want to go back, finally, to my constituents. I see the Minister of Labour—and I don't say this in a pejorative fashion—is here. I want to draw to his attention—because I presume he's the person who would have been involved with small business development; I may be mistaken. Minister, I was raising the issue in the House that there were two constituents of

mine from the city of Brampton; one of them was Panther Systems of Canada. I spoke about them in the House on a private member's statement, and in essence what happened was, by the small business development legislation being withdrawn—this gentleman had an opportunity to occupy some 30,000 square feet of a facility in an electronic manufacturing area employing and training 35 to 40 personnel by February 1994. As a direct result of the NDP government discontinuing the small business development corporations program, this isn't likely to happen. This letter was dated April 25, 1993, by the way.

They'd arranged for a number of investors to supply an influx of \$2.5 million into the corporate coffers. This would have allowed them to move into the new facilities and hire and train 35 to 45 new employees. The arrangements took over eight months of negotiations and countless expenses to complete, in effect, five to six other small businesses and \$10 million to \$15 million in total investment of capital of their own. The funds would have been capitalized over the course of the summer, as the investors would not be able to release their capital from other investments any sooner.

As the SBDC avenue is no longer available—listen to this; we're worried about the North American free trade agreement—these investors have now decided to put their money in other areas such as US-based GICs. So we lost that.

The second one is Mr Bravin, whom I spoke to you about. He, as I said, travelled for a year in Europe in November 1991. He arranged for mortgages to be placed on his family properties and arranged collateral to collect the capital that he could. He spent a year of painful search, sleeping in hotels and flights back and forth. He finally succeeded in obtaining credit in a form he could use here in Canada.

On his return on January 10, 1993, he contacted the program in Oshawa to ascertain that the program was still in effect and that there was funding. He was given a positive response, which prompted him to continue to formalize the loans. When he contacted the program on May 18, 1993, to inquire if he had to reapply and revive his application, he was told the program was cancelled in order to cut costs.

This gentleman spent in the neighbourhood of \$150,000 during that year to achieve his share of the capital. He planned to invest about \$4 million in Ontario small business. That was to create jobs to help our economy, and it would have created 40 new jobs, save from bankruptcy another 30 jobs and secure stability for 10 more. The grant would have generated \$1 million for him, which is understandable. It would also have saved the treasury—this is the federal treasury—UIC payments for 40 persons now and 30 in the future.

He worked it out as to how much this cost our



treasury in cancelling this program and he figured out that Ontario's portion was \$245,700 that we lost because the jobs weren't created. We also lost the benefit of 70 persons earning about \$35,000 a year and paying taxes at a rate of 30%. Ontario's portion would have been \$294,000. The disposable income, if spent, generating sales tax—and that's an estimate, obviously—was \$56,000. He came to a total of \$595,000 per year we lost because we cancelled that program. All I say is, if his figures are correct, it means that in an attempt to cut costs, we in fact lost out.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Brampton South for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Hon Mr Allen:** I want to thank the member for his address and I want to say to all members who participated this evening that I have enjoyed this evening's debates in a way that I have not enjoyed the House for a long, long time.

Having been in this House for many years, I know that this House can rise to very fine debating. It has always been able to and it can do today. There are many members of this Legislature who have outstanding experience in fields both personal and professional and who bring to this House a great capacity to inform us, each other, about their knowledge, their experience, and can lead us into better policy formation as a result.

I want to thank the member in that regard. I know that he in particular has got some deep interest in learning disability questions, and the remarks that he made on that subject I thought were very germane, as were some of his other remarks.

I want to note, where he raised the question around the \$30,000 income cutoff in Bill 48, that not only is there the provision of the question in the charter of what is reasonable in a free and democratic society; there's also subsection (2) in section 15, where it at least suggests that with regard to unequals, it is proper to treat unequals differently in order to achieve an equal result. If he will go back and look at that section, he will see that that principle at least is in the charter and would probably defend the low-income cutoff as a proper proposition.

Finally, might I also add that I certainly believe that all of us need to get out of some very bad habits that we've developed in this Legislature since the election. We do need to listen to each other better and more, and we'll be able to learn something as a result and our policies will be better both as a government and our contributions from the opposition as well.

**Mr Phillips:** I wanted to comment on my colleague from Brampton South's remarks and say it's fairly vintage—I might say Callahan, but fairly vintage the member for Brampton South in that, as the other member opposite suggested, there are many issues that

the member feels deeply about. I think he's one of our best members in terms of representing both his constituency and certain issues that he takes an extreme interest in.

I think one of the challenges for the Legislature will be that as we wrestle with the fiscal situation we on the opposite side will periodically be bringing issues to the Legislature that perhaps do involve expenditure. I know that in the cut-and-thrust of the House, it's, "There they go: Spend, spend, spend." I would hope that we would at least listen to some of these issues.

I kept the speech, actually, that the Minister of Education and Training gave because it was an announcement of spending. The justification for it, understandably, was that this is an area we are going to increase our spending in because it's an area that has priority. Although the member for Brampton South indicated, at least in some of the areas he raised, that there was no increased spending, I think we are going to have to, on the opposition side, feel free to bring forward areas where we think the priorities are wrong and where we are perhaps making the wrong spending decisions.

I would hope the government, as it can, would periodically listen to those areas. They should certainly feel free to say, "There they go spending again," but I think we're going to have to discriminate a little bit on where legitimate spending cuts are being made and where we're not making legitimate cuts.

2240

**Mr Stockwell:** The difference, I think, today between even locally elected or federally elected or provincially elected legislatures, or politicians of all sorts, is that public time is being taken up with debates about finances. Money has become the issue. It just wasn't the case; I can remember 10 short years ago it was never a question of money, hardly ever a question of taxes. It was a question of services. It was always of service expansion.

I can remember vividly debates on social assistance increases and health care expenditure increases, grants from the cultural to the social side. The difference I've noticed, at least in the last few years, particularly since this government got elected, through no adjustment on its own—the simple fact is that the recession hit. It's a very difficult recession, and the whole makeup of what we debate in this place and places about, in municipalities and even the federal government, is almost completely dominated around financing, because everything needs money. Whether it's health care or social services, anything needs money. If you don't have money, you begin to dominate with the topic, "How do we get money, how do we create money or how do we cut?"

It was refreshing to hear the member from Brampton speak, because it has been a while since you've heard a discussion like that. I don't think it's wrong, or I

don't think that we're wrong in the discussion and the thrust that this place has gone. It does become a little more difficult, a little more confrontational, because when things are cut, everyone feels that everything that's cut that they want is the wrong thing that cuts should be made to. You learn that from any level of government you're at.

I'll commend the member. It was a good speech. It was interesting and certainly—vintage Callahan? I'm not sure. Vintage Callahan I've seen. That wasn't vintage Callahan, in my opinion. But I enjoyed it and I thank the member for the comments. I don't honestly think there was any thought of frivolity about the comments you made. I think everyone took them as seriously as you meant them to be taken.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** I just want to make a comment in regard to the specific remarks made regarding schizophrenia, mostly because I agree with the member. I want to state it on the record that I will be doing my part to assist in terms of what I appreciated most about the comments, that he wasn't asking for more money to be spent, just that—and correct me if I'm wrong, of course—there was a reallocation of funding to the research and development that can go into schizophrenia.

I know that in my riding I have had the Friends of Schizophrenia come and speak to me on numerous occasions, as I'm sure most of us in this House have, and we have heard the heart-rending stories, as has been stated, if we haven't all been touched by someone who has schizophrenia or who has to deal with the disease.

Having said that, it is very true, and speaking as someone who was an advocate for both Elie Martel and Shelley Martel prior to my election, we had to deal in many instances with the fact that they do utilize the criminal justice system, that our social network costs are unbelievably high and that our health costs are unbelievably high just in relation to this one disease. It has been lost between the cracks, as the member opposite has stated. I do appreciate the comments that were made, and I want to reaffirm my position on this and thank him for his participation.

**The Speaker:** The member for Brampton South has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Callahan:** I want to thank all members for their comments. I want to start off by apologizing to the member from Yorkview.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Downsview.

**Mr Callahan:** Downsview, or whoever. It was uncalled for. I shouldn't have done that. I have great admiration for everybody in this House. The issue is one that's extremely close to my heart and I guess I misinterpreted what was happening.

It's late. I promised as the last speaker that I would turn out the lights and put out the cat. I think it's time to go home. Mr Speaker, without using up my full two minutes, which my wife will be very pleased about, I must say that the other night—Mr Speaker, you weren't in the chair, Mr Villeneuve was—I did use the name of someone greater than I and I shouldn't have. I apologize for that as well.

Having said that, I believe I can move adjournment of the House. I move adjournment of the House.

**Ms Murdock:** No.

**Mr Callahan:** No? Oh, I'm sorry. I will defer to the House leader.

**The Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that the interim supply motion carry? Agreed.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I would like to indicate the business for the coming week.

On Monday, June 28, we will consider, in the following order, second reading of Bill 25, the loan act; third reading of Bill 102, the pay equity act; second reading on Bills 32 and 34, the vehicle transfer package; second reading of Bill 29, an act to repeal the commercial concentration tax; and certain private members' bills which the three House leaders have been discussing, and we hope to have them determined by Monday.

The business for Tuesday, June 29, and Wednesday, June 30, will be announced.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The government House leader moves adjournment of the House?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Yes, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried. This House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock, Monday next.

The House adjourned at 2247.





# CONTENTS

Thursday 24 June 1993

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION

### **Interim supply, government notice of motion number 7**

Mr Laughren	1967
Mr Bradley	1967, 1983
Mr Hope	1981
Mr Jim Wilson	1982, 2000, 2006, 2007, 2013
Ms Harrington	1982
Mr Turnbull	1982, 2013, 2019, 2023
Mr Stockwell	1983, 2001, 2022, 2029
Mr Wildman	1999
Mr Mahoney	2000, 2001, 2006
Mr Mammoliti	2000
Mr Mackenzie	2006
Mrs Grier	2012
Mr Phillips	2012, 2013, 2018, 2029
Mr Allan	2017, 2028
Mr Callahan	2018, 2022, 2023, 2030
Mr Gary Wilson	2018, 2023
Mr Buchanan	2022
Ms Murdock	2029

### **Meetings of the House, government notice of motion number 5**

Mr Charlton	1985
-------------	------

## OTHER BUSINESS

### **Business of the House**

Mr Charlton	2030
-------------	------





No. 39

N° 39

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

## Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 28 June 1993

## Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 28 juin 1993



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Monday 28 June 1993

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### COMMUNITY SPORTS PROGRAMS

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** As a parent of four school-aged children, I want to pay special tribute to a large group of volunteers active in my riding and, I am sure, throughout the rest of Ontario as well. The people I am referring to are those good people who give so generously of their time in community-based sports programs for children.

As a result of the good efforts of these volunteers, children in Ottawa South and indeed across the province are given the opportunity to develop their skills in a variety of sports. In addition, they learn important lessons that will serve them well throughout their lives. Our kids are learning lessons about sportsmanship, playing as part of a team, learning to live with victories and defeats, hard work and having fun.

Contrary to what many of us think, our children are not all little darlings and we as parents are not all perfectly reasonable. As such, parents and children alike can present real challenges to the coaches, assistant coaches and other volunteers who, smiling all the while, help to set up the teams, arrange the schedules for practices and games, train the kids during practices and coach them during the games. Then, of course, they must involve themselves in the mandatory celebration at the end of the season.

I tip my hat to the volunteers of the Canterbury Minor Hockey Association, the Alta Vista Little League and the many, many other volunteers throughout the province who give so freely of their time in community-based sports programs for our children. I'm sure all members will join me in thanking these people for their dedication, their patience, their genuine interest in our kids and their sense of community spirit.

##### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** The Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education is facing budget cuts of \$3.6 million as part of the requirements of the social contract. To a small board with a budget of just \$90 million, that's a lot of money.

The board understands and accepts the need to curtail the cost to present and future taxpayers. However, the board is also looking for credit where credit is due. The Leeds and Grenville board is already in year two of a three-year plan to cut \$15 million from its costs. As part of that plan, the board this year slashed \$5.7 million from its operating expenditures. Unfortunately, that cut was made before details of the social contract became known.

The board now faces the unpleasant possibility of slashing another \$3.6 million from its compensation costs without ever getting credit for the proactive approach it undertook in 1992-93. These cuts included returning 10 teaching consultants to the classroom, not replacing a retiring superintendent, eliminating seven speech therapists and six teaching assistants and axing seven maintenance and cleaning jobs. A three-year salary freeze in place this year will save the board \$1.1 million alone.

The Leeds and Grenville board—and I understand there are three or four other boards that have made similar sacrifices—is extremely concerned these substantial cost-cutting measures will go unrecognized. The board wants the opportunity to demonstrate to the Minister of Education and Training how the cost reductions have been achieved and to make its case that they should be recognized as meeting the social contract plan.

I'm looking for assurances from the minister that some flexibility will be built into the Social Contract Act and its regulations to allow for such special circumstances.

##### CHILD WITNESS PROGRAM

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** I rise in the House today to express my pleasure that the London Family Court Clinic child witness program has finally received permanent funding from Ontario in its efforts to help child victims and witnesses understand the criminal justice process and their role as witnesses.

In 1987, the London Family Court Clinic was established with funding from the sexual abuse initiatives program of the federal government for a three-year demonstration project on child witness court preparation. In 1990, federal funding was terminated and since 1991, the province provided temporary funding on a year-to-year basis. Now, with permanent funding in place, the child witness program can continue to help children learn to identify and reduce their fears and stresses, such things as what an oath is and the difference between the truth and a lie and how the court operates.

This preparation is making a positive difference. Findings of guilt occur in 70% of cases with prepared child witnesses versus only 40% where the child witnesses are unprepared.

There is also a wider benefit. Young, impressionable individuals are being shown that caring and concern are at the heart of our justice system and that access to and respect for the laws are for everyone. This understanding will abide with them throughout their lives, making them better citizens and better people.

I congratulate Dr Peter Jaffe, Dr Louise Sas and the other members of the project team, who have laboured to make this program a successful model for the rest of the province to emulate.

#### MULTICULTURALISM

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Seneca College's commitment to multicultural workplace programs and its principles is well known and highly regarded. Seneca College's multicultural workplace program is the college's conduit for addressing many multicultural issues with the college's business partners.

The Ministry of Citizenship should be very proud and supportive of Seneca College's achievements. In fact last May, in 1992, Minister Elaine Ziemba awarded Seneca College a certificate recognizing the college's five-year contribution to multicultural workplace issues and program. On that certificate, it was cited that Seneca College was a partner of the ministry.

Guess what's happened? Today Seneca College has notified me that the ministry is no longer committed to that program and is recommending that the program be discontinued. Seneca College's multicultural workplace program is now questioning why this partnership is being arbitrarily dissolved, because the past 18 months have demonstrated that the multicultural workplace program makes economic sense for both business and industry.

The riding of Oriole contains 5% of everyone. The multicultural workplace program is an important link, and I stand here today speaking on behalf of that program, saying to the minister that we believe the decision is wrong, and we ask you to reconsider your position prior to a formal appeal. We hope that you will continue the important multicultural workplace program at Seneca College.

1340

#### CANADA DAY

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** July 1 marks Canada's 126th birthday. A number of my Don Mills constituents will be celebrating their country's birthday in a very special way at the East York Canada Day celebrations. This East York tradition, which has been ongoing for decades, marks not only the pride we feel as Canadians but also the pride we feel in our local community. It is only fitting that the celebration is planned and executed by hundreds of hardworking volunteers under the able guidance of chairman Les Anthony.

The kickoff will begin with the swearing in of new Canadian citizens at the citizenship court at the East York Civic Centre. The community parade, with its marching bands and many floats, will then take to its route, proceeding to Stan Wadlow Park, where a full day of activities has been arranged.

During the day, about 40,000 people will come to

enjoy the many events, including the talent shows highlighting the creative energies of our young people, multicultural shows, dozens of booths brimming with information on community programs, historical and cultural exhibits, sporting event demonstrations, the Kiwanis bingo, the fireworks, the petting zoo, singing and dancing and community service exhibitions from the Metropolitan Toronto Police and the East York firefighters.

On July 1, East York residents will celebrate a giant birthday party, but they will really be celebrating our rights, freedoms and heritage as Canadians and how we truly are distinct as a culture and a nation. I welcome everyone to take part in East York's tribute to Canada.

BILL BERG

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise today to pay tribute to an up and coming NHL star from my riding, Bill Berg of the Toronto Maple Leafs. Bill is well known throughout Beamsville, the quaint little town where he played minor hockey. He is also a celebrity just down the road in Grimsby, where he played for the junior B Peach Kings. After being traded to the Leafs from the New York Islanders, Bill quickly proved himself worthy of wearing number 10, the number once worn by the legendary George Armstrong.

Bill's aggressive style was important in helping the Leafs make it to this year's Stanley Cup semifinals. I'm sure we can expect more, possibly a Stanley Cup, from Bill and the Leafs next year.

I had the pleasure of meeting Bill a couple of weeks ago. I must say that he's a polite young man, an excellent role model for the young people of Ontario. Bill Berg is an inspiration because he is an example of what can be achieved through hard work and dedication. He shows that dreams really can come true.

I would like to congratulate Bill Berg for his outstanding contribution to hockey, and I'd like to thank the minor hockey people of Beamsville for guiding Bill through the early years of his athletic career.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** Last Tuesday, I think it was, on June 22, the member for Victoria-Haliburton gave what I consider an extremely perceptive and excellent speech. I recommend this speech to all the members of the House and in particular the members of the government.

Just to whet the appetite, in particular the Premier's, since he's here, I would like to recall a few of the passages that the member from Haliburton put on the record here in the House. I understand the member for Victoria-Haliburton is still a card-carrying member for the NDP. Now, I'm not sure about this, but I'm told that this is still the case. In fact, he used to be the caucus chairman of the current government. Well, here's what the member for Victoria-Haliburton had to say



about Bill 48, the social contract negotiations.

He says this bill is the most draconian "that has ever come before this Legislature; in fact a bill that I would say is going to have a disastrous effect on the relationship between trade unionists and the government for years and years to come."

The member for Victoria-Haliburton goes on to say one would have expected that in our current economic climate "a social democratic government would have put a priority on the creation of jobs and a need to reaffirm its commitment to labour.... Rather, the government has chosen dictatorial uses of power and a total rejection of social democratic principles.... It's a government that has moved decidedly and decisively to the right."

I welcome these comments, and I recommend them to all the members of the House and particularly the members of the government.

#### ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** The people of York Mills are deeply concerned about the actions of this government on the economic front. Bill 40 drove investment out of this province, and the Premier's statements in Davos, Switzerland, sent a confusing message to the international community about the merits of investing in Ontario.

The \$2-billion tax grab in the 1993 budget does nothing to stimulate our economy as the tax hikes will have a devastating effect on disposable income levels and result in reduced consumer spending.

A provincial unemployment rate of 10.7% and a Metro Toronto rate of 10.1% are unacceptable. We have seen no long-term solution proposed by this government.

Jobs Ontario announcements, made with such relish, are not a long-term solution but a Band-Aid, short-term fix that creates temporary jobs.

Tax hikes in the budget will eliminate 50,000 jobs, one job lost for every \$40,000 in new taxes, whereas the government will spend \$700 million in Jobs Ontario Capital to create 12,000 jobs. For every two jobs the government creates, it will eliminate three.

The best source of job creation is a revitalized economy and a tax level which encourages consumer spending.

Hundreds of constituents on fixed incomes and seniors on pensions have written to me calling for expenditure reduction as means of restoring prosperity as opposed to tax hikes, as fixed-income households are defenceless in the face of tax hikes. My constituents demand concrete solutions to these problems and not just empty rhetoric.

#### YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** As you well

know, certainly since our election in 1990, the biggest issue facing the Ontario public and the Canadian public at large has been the question of unemployment. While unemployment has been raging in this country and in this province for the last two and a half years, the federal government has sat idly by and done nothing in terms of getting Ontarians and Canadians back to work while our government has tried to deal in a very meaningful way with this particular issue through a number of programs: the Jobs Ontario Training fund, the Jobs Ontario Capital fund and, with respect to youth, the Jobs Ontario Youth program.

However, the ability of this government to create jobs is fairly limited and the federal government has refused to respond in any way to this particular issue. What they should be looking at is a national youth employment program. The federal government refuses to do that.

I believe Kim Campbell, as the new Prime Minister of Canada, should call an election as quickly as possible and put these issues before the Canadian public so that the public can have a say with respect to their idleness on this issue.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Statements by ministers?

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Earlier, during members' statements, the member for London South stood in his place and announced that within his area, within London—it may not even be within his riding, or it may be; it's not that relevant—the government had permanently funded a witness protection program.

The member for London South is also the parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General. If the government wishes to make statements during ministers' statements, then it is welcome to do that, but there were no statements today, as just witnessed by your previous call for ministers' statements.

By allowing the parliamentary assistant to make in essence a government statement, it denies the opposition the opportunity to respond. I don't think the statement today was that significant—it's probably somewhat unnecessary—but the principle whereby a parliamentary assistant stands and in essence makes a government statement, thereby denying the opposition, should be addressed.

I ask you to review the Hansard and perhaps rule on that so we can keep the government straight in the future on these matters.

1350

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** On the point of order, Mr Speaker: Perhaps to save you a little time, I think the statement that was made by the member for London South was in fact, as the member opposite has suggested, an inappropriate

statement for him to be making as a private member. We concede that and just would like to say on behalf of the member that it was an honest mistake on his part. He saw it as a local issue that dealt with his local community, and from our perspective, the resolution which the member seeks is inappropriate.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** So you're agreed to a short response?

To the member for Carleton, he indeed, it would appear, has a valid point of order. I trust the member realizes that it's very difficult for the Chair to know whether or not something which is being said by a member is in fact an announcement of government policy. But the member's point is well taken, and the government House leader has offered that if members, one from each of the opposition parties, wish to respond, then of course that is in order. Is there a member from the official opposition who wishes to make a response?

#### CHILD WITNESS PROGRAM

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I'd just like to respond that we're happy to see the child witness program, which was put in on a trial basis some time ago, I think 10 or 15 years ago, and has been continuing on an ad hoc basis. It is the type of program within the justice system which the member for Burlington South has included in his victims' rights bill and something which we support very much.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the statement by the parliamentary assistant. As he well knows, we've been discussing the issue of assistance to victims in the justice committee for some time. I hope this is an indication that not only are they going to fund the child witness program in his riding but, as we've heard in evidence in that committee, expand that program to across the province.

There's a crying need for protection of victims all through the criminal justice system. Child witnesses of course are a particular problem and need to have particular regard paid to them, but also victims of violent crime who are providing evidence against the perpetrators.

There are only 12 or 13 programs in this province, and we've heard a crying need for the expansion of those programs across the province.

A ministry official came and testified before our committee that the expansion of that program would not be a significant amount of money. We would like to see the government expand that program. It's a fine initiative that was built on by my predecessor in this very seat, the Honourable Ian Scott, when he was Attorney General, and I hope the government will take this as an opportunity to expand those programs available to victims.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question will be for the Premier. I want to note in raising this question that we have had yet another example of this government making an announcement of its totally arbitrary actions on a Friday when it hopes no one is watching. I say to the Premier that I am completely dismayed that we have yet another announcement from the Minister of Health which will have devastating effects on the health system of this province.

The Premier will be well aware that the minister has announced that as part of the government's long-term care reform, the private home care sector will be limited to providing 10% of home care services. The minister has made this announcement with the full knowledge that the private sector currently provides approximately 45% of these services. There is no doubt from the minister's statement that this government's ultimate goal is to shut out the private home health care providers altogether, yet everything I hear from seniors, from their families, is that the private sector is providing quality services and people are satisfied with the kinds of services they're getting. The private sector is currently providing 45% of the service, and with that fact in place, there surely is no doubt that it is filling an important need.

I ask the Premier, can you tell us what evidence you have that the services that are currently being provided by the private sector will be somehow better provided by the public sector? How will the services continue to be provided at all if you shut out the providers who are giving 45% of the service?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I will refer that question to the Minister of Health.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Thank you, and I apologize for being late.

Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that this government has been very clear, from the beginning of our discussions about the expansion of community-based services for long-term care, that it favours those services being delivered by the not-for-profit sector.

I would remind her that this is a growth sector. There are going to be 5,000 more jobs delivering home care than there are at the present time, and as we spend very scarce taxpayers' dollars, we believe it's more appropriate to spend those dollars on not-for-profit services, that they make sure they all go to wages and to services, not to profit.

**Mrs McLeod:** I suppose I'm not surprised that the Premier referred the question, but let me say that I am really dismayed that the Premier stands by while this Minister of Health dismantles the public health care system, the health care system this province enjoys.



This is pure ideology, and this is costly ideology at a time when we simply cannot afford it. We have seen this government charge ahead before with ideological blinders on, and in fact we've seen this minister charge ahead with ideological blinders on.

The minister does not need to remind me of what this government's intentions are. In fact, I say advisedly that this is a dismantling of the public health care system, because we simply cannot afford to replace the services which this minister is removing which the private health care system has been providing in support of the public health care system.

We have raised this issue before, the fact that, in writing, the government's response on this issue has shown that it is more costly for the public sector to provide these services. I ask you to tell us today how much more it will cost the taxpayers of Ontario to deliver these services under your new policy, I ask you whether you have done any studies to assess the full cost of your policy preference, and I ask you, how much money should Ontario taxpayers have to spend so that home care services can be provided in a way which is more ideologically satisfying to your government?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** There seems to be some confusion in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. She says we are dismantling the public health care system. In fact, what we are doing is strengthening and expanding the public health care system. I would say to her again that under our expansion of the integrated homemaker program we are not cutting any services, we are not cutting any hours, we are not cutting any workers; we are in fact putting more dollars into the system, expanding the system and creating new jobs.

Let me also say to the Leader of the Opposition that this is entirely consistent with the basis of our long-term care program and with what we heard in a very extensive public consultation about this program. What we heard was that people want accountability in the delivery of these services, and they want these services delivered by community-based agencies with community boards that respond to the needs of their particular communities.

**Mrs McLeod:** I say again to the minister that there are private health care providers who have been providing an important support and supplement to our public health care system. We don't believe you can continue to maintain the high quality and accessibility of health care to the people of this province if you keep trying to take under the public health care system all of the costs of the services that are now being provided by those private health care providers.

I simply don't understand where you are hearing that there is a lack of accountability, a lack of quality in the services that are being provided in those areas. That's not what any of us hear from our constituents who are making the choices, who are satisfied with the quality

and who want the access to those services to continue.

Nor do I understand how you can say that there's no job loss. The private health care providers are clearly saying that there could be at least 10,000 jobs lost as a result of the policy decision which you made on Friday. You don't seem to be worried about this. It's almost as if, in your philosophy, jobs that are provided in the public sector are somehow better jobs than those that are provided in the private sector. I say to you again, as we have said before, a job is a job is a job, and the people of this province need health care; in fact, they need jobs more than they need NDP ideology.

I ask, how can you simply put 10,000 people out of work? Please don't tell us you're doing it to save money, because this is not what you're doing to save money. How can you justify a policy that is going to cost taxpayers money, that is going to reduce access to home health care and will put people out of work all at the same time?

1400

**Hon Mrs Grier:** First of all, whether or not it is 10,000 people in the private sector who are now providing the services which the province pays for or whether it's 5,000 people is very hard to determine.

Secondly, let me say to the Leader of the Opposition, no matter what the number is, we are not putting people out of work. We are in fact creating new jobs and putting new people to work. For those people who have currently been working in the private sector, if they choose to apply for the new jobs that are going to be created, that transition will be assisted as part of long-term care.

To hear a member representing a party that was in power for seven years and talked about long-term care and never expanded long-term care now accuse us, as we move to take action on long-term care, of being ideological is a little hard to take.

**Mrs McLeod:** I simply don't think this government cares how its policies are affecting either the jobs or the people who hold those jobs. They are real people and they are providing real service, and there's no acknowledgement of that whatsoever.

#### TAX INCREASES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** As I move to the second question, I would also recognize that this government did not pay a whole lot of attention to the way in which its budget was going to affect jobs or the economy of this province. I direct my second question to the Premier as he even now anticipates the question and refers it to his Finance minister.

Premier, I do think it's important that as we prepare to celebrate Canada Day, we recognize that July 1 is also going to mark the date when over \$1 billion of your \$2-billion tax grab comes into effect. I remind people that it is the largest tax increase ever and the

largest since the Tory government budget of 1982.

From July 1 to the end of the fiscal year, Ontarians are going to pay \$1.14 billion more in income taxes. That is \$1.14 billion that could have gone back into the economy to create more jobs. I ask once again, what impact is this tax grab going to have on Ontario's fragile economy? Will you explain whether the \$2-billion tax grab is the reason why your Finance minister is now predicting continued double-digit unemployment for the next three years?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'm going to refer that to the Minister of Finance.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** The leader of the official opposition is correct in that the income tax changes take place on July 1. I would remind her that even with these income tax changes that will take place, for 90% of the people in this province, Ontario will be the third lowest in all of Canada in terms of its income tax rate. For people in the top 10% of income earners in the province, we are second highest. I say that with some pride, because I do believe that we have moved towards making the tax system fairer than it otherwise would be.

Finally, I would remind the leader of the official opposition, when she talks about \$1 billion, that \$1 billion is not taken out of the economy. It's put right back into the economy for services that she herself often demands more of in this province and also for capital projects which will go to benefit the private sector as well as the public sector. So I'd ask her to put it in context as to what that money is used for. It's used to keep the essential services in this province and to continue to invest in our infrastructure.

**Mrs McLeod:** Interesting response, given the Minister of Health's response to my first question, because it seems to me you can relate the two and say that the \$1 billion in taxes or a significant portion of it is going to go right back into creating the jobs to replace the private sector jobs in home health care, which this minister is just in the process of destroying.

Treasurer, I would suggest to you that people were dismayed by their tax increases in your budget coming at this very difficult time in our economy, but they were absolutely disbelieving that you brought in income tax increases that were retroactive to last January. You are implementing your retroactive increase by doubling the tax increase that you're going to collect between now and the end of this fiscal year. I ask you, how do you justify retroactive tax increases? How do you justify getting the taxes from a full year of tax increases in just six months and how can people develop any investor confidence when your government not only raises taxes for the future but raises taxes for the past?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'd stand that question on its head and say to the leader of the official opposition,

how can the people of this province have any confidence in the leader of the official opposition and the party that she leads in this province, namely, the Liberal Party of Ontario, who consistently say that they don't want any tax increases, consistently say that our deficit's too high, that they don't like what we're doing in the social contract legislation to contain costs in the public sector and that they want more money spent on various programs across the province? Don't talk to me about credibility or confidence. You're the one who's lost any you had when you first took over that position.

**Mrs McLeod:** I should remind the Finance minister they're supposed to save that stock response for the second supplementary and not the first supplementary. That's usually when it is trotted out. Usually when this government has absolutely no response and doesn't even want to acknowledge the legitimacy of a question being asked, it saves that stock response for its fallback position.

I would remind the Finance minister that it is our very firm belief that you do indeed have to meet your deficit target with expenditure reductions, and we have given you many suggestions on how that could be done, but that we have also always said that unless you can get this economy going again you are not going to be able to meet your deficit targets, and unless you can really get people back to work again we are not going to solve the most essential challenges facing this province. That's why we have said you should not have brought those tax increases in and that's why we continue to say, "Did you even look at the impact on the economy of those tax increases?"

But my second supplementary was related to the fact that in addition to raising taxes you managed to slip in about \$220 million in 35 new fees; at least, 35 is as many as we have yet been about to count. The fee increases are going to affect people literally from the cradle to the grave, and as you well know, they have affected virtually everything you could find to tax, from birth and marriage and death certificate fees, to road test fees, to driver's licence fees, to land registration fees. I simply ask you again, how many jobs are these fee increases going to cost the people of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** In many instances, when we talk about increases in fees that are non-tax revenues, such as licences and stumpage fees and those kinds of things, there hadn't been increases for some time and it really is saying to people that for those services delivered, it's time that people paid for the cost of delivering them. I would say to the leader of the official opposition that now she's not only against any tax increases to solve our problem; she's against any non-tax revenues to solve our fiscal problems as well.

So I really would like the leader of the official opposition to stand in her place one day before this session adjourns and tell us how she would accomplish



a reduction in the deficit at the same time as she's calling for no tax increases, more spending and no reduction in public sector compensation. I would like to have the leader of the official opposition tell us how she would accomplish that.

#### FIRST MINISTERS' MEETING

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** My question is to the Premier. Given that the economy should be the number one priority and given that you spent the weekend whining that Ontario no longer has a voice at the federal cabinet table, would you please explain why you would play partisan politics and refuse to attend the first ministers' conference?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would be the last person to play partisan politics. I would say to the honourable member, given the comments that were made by his leader last week vis-à-vis Ontario's relationship to Quebec, the member for Oakville South has a lot of explaining to do when he criticizes me for having raised the fact that in the federal Conservative cabinet Ontario's position is weaker in terms of representation, compared to Quebec and compared to western Canada, than at any time in living memory. If he doesn't understand that and doesn't see this as an issue that's of concern, then I think he's going to be quite wrong.

1410

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Then go to the meeting; all the more reason to go to the meeting.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Willowdale.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that I remain sceptical of a dinner session—

**Mr Harnick:** Go to the cottage, Bob.

**The Speaker:** The member for Willowdale, please come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —and would say to the honourable member that the issues—

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** You are just a disgrace. You are bringing this province down.

**The Speaker:** The member for York Mills, come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —that need to be dealt with are issues that can be resolved only after a federal election. They can be resolved only when a federal government has a clear mandate to deal with them and where there's a long-term agenda that needs to be dealt with. That's precisely the position that I put forward as Premier of the province in defence of the interests of the province of Ontario.

**Mr Carr:** This from a Premier who has done more to destroy this province economically, politically and socially than any other Premier in the history of this province.

If you'd done the same thing as the federal govern-

ment in scaling back the cabinet when the member for Perth left the cabinet, what you should have done is not replaced her instead of having cabinet ministers, second-stringers, whose only function is to ride around in the cars.

My question as a follow-up to the Premier is this: Canada's economic position cannot be put on hold; neither can Ontario's. When these premiers are going to this meeting, and apparently all of them will be going, I ask the Premier, who is going to speak on behalf of Ontario if the Premier for Ontario is not there? Who's going to speak on behalf of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would only say to the honourable member that there is a major federal-provincial agenda that needs to be addressed. All I've said from the beginning is, first of all, Ontario's positions with respect to these issues are well known and well documented to everyone concerned and, second of all, very clearly these are major issues that need to be resolved once the federal election is out of the way but that we have to recognize that the issues are so complex and so important to this province that—

**Mr Turnbull:** They're so complex you're going to stay home.

**The Speaker:** The member for York Mills, please come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —they are not something which can simply be handled in the space of a couple of hours meeting in Vancouver. It's as simple as that.

**Mr Carr:** This is the same Premier who got together with the two NDP premiers, Harcourt and Romanow, for a photo opportunity and said that those three were going to tackle the deficit. Yet, when other premiers are going to be out there, maybe he'll learn something from Clyde Wells of what he's doing with his civil servants, maybe he'll learn a little bit from Premier Bourassa, he may learn something from Premier Filmon out there. It is not just dealing with the provincial or the federal government. He will have an opportunity to speak to his colleagues about what is happening.

The G7 meeting is coming up. The Prime Minister will be going to that meeting. In your budget you talk about how trade is so important to the province of Ontario. As the Prime Minister goes to the G7 meeting, quite simply, do you want Ontario's view on global trade to be represented at the G7 meeting or not? If not, how are we going to get our message through to the major industrialized countries which are dealing with important issues? Who's going to speak on our behalf?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Obviously, the Premier of this province has to do everything in his power to advance the interests of the people of this province, which is what I've been trying to do since the election. I would only say to the honourable member that I am truly astounded that the Tory caucus in this province wasn't

out there on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, since, as I say, his leader was so critical of us, saying he would take a two-by-four to Premier Bourassa.

Here we have a clear instance. You have the federal Minister of Industry, who is now also responsible for Quebec regional development and the Deputy Premier, you have the Finance minister from Quebec; you have the president of the Treasury Board coming from Alberta. Where are Ontario's interests being represented in the heart of the Conservative Party?

You can go out and campaign for that cabinet. You go out and campaign for the Tories' negligence to this province and for their historic determination to seriously underrepresent and misrepresent and misunderstand the people of this province. You can wear that the next election campaign; that's the way it should be. When the election is over, then we will have a major federal-provincial conference to deal with these issues, and let me tell you, we will be there representing the people of Ontario and the interests of the people of Ontario.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question is for the Attorney General.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member for Burlington South has the floor.

**Mr Jackson:** Minister, yesterday in Burlington more than 250 people gathered at Brant Bible Church to remember those who have died of violent crimes in Ontario. This memorial service was organized by Burlington resident Debbie Mahaffy, who two years ago tomorrow received the shocking news that her daughter was dead.

Among the victims who were commemorated at this service were Andrea Atkinson, Elizabeth Bain, Nina de Villiers, Kristen French, Christine Jessup, Kayla Klau-dusz, Leslie Mahaffy, Alison Parrott and more than 30 others. After the service, Debbie Mahaffy and many of the parents of victims of violence, of this violent crime, came to speak to me about the importance of what they believe should be an observance for Ontario, a victims' rights day to be declared for Ontario. This would be a day set aside for observances for all of our province to understand the trauma and the victimization that continues for victims of violence and their lack of rights.

Minister, my question to you is, will you stand in the House today and pledge in a spirit of humanitarian concern on behalf of Ontario victims and their families your government's full support for a private member's bill through first and second and third readings that would enunciate a clear day, a victims' rights day for Ontario, and to have that implemented within the next three or four weeks so that this can become an annual observance for those families?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I think it

sounds like an idea that would have the support of everybody in the House and it sounds very feasible to me. The only concern I would have is that I think we should talk about how that crosses over with the December 6 day of memorial and mourning that is now a nationwide and certainly a provincial day of mourning for women who have been victimized by violence. But I understand that the member is suggesting a specific day around victims' rights, and I certainly am quite prepared, if he brings forward such a motion, to support it myself and to urge my colleagues to do so.

**Mr Jackson:** During yesterday's commemorative service, Sergeant Paul Welsh, who had been seconded to the Ministry of the Solicitor General's office for some years and is now back with the Halton Regional Police, said that people are starting to realize that the current criminal justice system is not victim-centred in Ontario. It is in fact accused-centred, but we are starting to realize that the victim is an integral part of the justice system.

As you are aware, Minister, an important part of the balancing of the roles of victims is the victims' perspective, as obtained through the victim impact statement, a point that was also contained among the many recommendations in the Jonathan Yeo inquest. Yesterday Mrs Mahaffy shared with me her concerns and showed me her victim impact statement that she wishes to present today. But the minister would be aware that the utilization of victim impact statements is not a consistent policy throughout our justice system.

Again, on behalf of Mrs Mahaffy and Mrs de Villiers, who have raised this question, could the minister confirm your willingness to ensure that victim impact statements become required in Ontario as an integral part of the due process of law? This is within your mandate. Actually, within your current law, you can do this through regulation. But on behalf of those two parents, could you please indicate to the House your willingness to pursue this in the name of justice?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** As a matter of fact, this is one of the items in the victims package that I released on Friday. There will be a province-wide, standardized victim impact statement policy introduced in the fall. It will follow the model that has been piloted in the Metropolitan Toronto area. The police will give the victim impact statement forms to their witnesses in these cases, encourage them to make use of them, and crown attorneys will certainly use them as part of the sentencing if a conviction is obtained during a trial.

1420

**Mr Jackson:** Minister, as you know, the justice committee is currently looking at victims' rights issues. The justice committee has been meeting for the last month. I'm delighted to hear of your news, but it gives limited comfort when you go behind the back of a legislative committee to make these spotty announce-



ments as opposed to working with the legislative framework and victims who came before the committee and made presentations.

Several of the victims who came forward during the course of the justice committee hearings included, of course, Mrs Priscilla de Villiers, who spoke at length about the fact that our courts need to realize that the victim is in fact a person. Although your comments give some limited relief, they still do not acknowledge the victim as a person in our justice system.

The Jonathan Yeo inquest report contains a very clear recommendation that there should be a victims' bill of rights for Ontario. As one of only two provinces without that bill, Minister, and on behalf of those who participated yesterday in the memorial service, I want to ask you, would you please advise this House that you are willing to establish a bill of rights for victims of crime on behalf of all potential victims in Ontario, including those families who have currently been victimized?

I remind you that your predecessor, Howard Hampton, voted in favour of the bill of rights for crime victims, which I tabled in this House back in 1990, when the Liberal government opposed it.

**The Speaker:** Could the member conclude his question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** Now that you are the government, would you please be consistent and now support the very bill which, while in opposition, you and your party were so keen to support? On behalf of those families, will you support a victims' bill of rights?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** When we were in opposition, we were not in a position to actually put into place the kinds of services victims require. We are now, and that is how we are proceeding. We are spending our legislative efforts and our administrative efforts in refocusing the criminal justice system to balance out the rights of the accused and the rights of victims.

We certainly agree with the member that this is an ongoing perception of those who have been victimized by crime, not only in our jurisdiction but frankly in most jurisdictions. It is important for us to find ways to give the kind of support, the kind of centredness to a system that really takes into account the pain and suffering that victims and their relatives feel, particularly in serious crimes of violence.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Health. On July 1, via regulations out of your long-term care legislation, there will be dramatic increases passed on to residents of nursing homes around the province. Indeed, in the Tyndall Nursing Home in my own community, but certainly everywhere throughout the province, people have been finding out recently the impact of these regulations; regulations, I might add, that were not

clearly spelled out during the debate of the legislation and that certainly did not give anyone any indication that they would be facing increases of the magnitude they'll be hit with on July 1.

Residents in a ward, very infirm in many cases, very ill, are facing increases of \$12 a day, seven days a week. That's \$84 a week. That's a \$361-a-month increase to these citizens who in most cases are on fixed incomes and who have no alternative but to reduce the amount of money that is available to them on a monthly basis because they have to pay you more. In essence, it amounts to a tax on the sick, on the elderly, on the infirm. How can you justify this tax?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I would certainly reject the member's categorization of the impact of Bill 101 and the accommodation charges that are currently going to be put in place. I would remind the member, who I think was part of that long discussion, that what we are doing under the levels-of-care funding is in fact creating for the first time some equity in accommodation costs across the system. Costs currently range from \$26 a day to \$90 a day. We are now saying there will be a flat charge of \$38 a day for accommodation costs. In many cases that means a reduction in costs for, I think, about 10,000 people, and for people at the lowest level of the income bracket there will be no change in their costs.

I would also remind the member that the way in which ability to pay is being calculated under the new system—and nobody will be denied accommodation because of inability to pay—is strictly on income, not on assets. For many old people in nursing homes, the threat of a lien on their house or of having to sell their assets has been a very real cause of fear. What the new system will do is provide reassurance in that respect and fair funding across the province.

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, I find that answer really quite remarkable. Could you explain the fairness to Dennis Jackson of Mississauga, who waited for two years to find accommodation somewhere in Mississauga so he could be close to his mother? He waited for two years and found her a room. It had to be a private room because there was no room in the wards. It had to be a private room, so he had to agree to pay \$1,407 a month to have his mother taken care of. She needs 24-hour care. It's not something that can be done in the home when both parents have to work. You understand that. Now Mr Jackson's being told, at a meeting last week, that he's going from \$1,407 up to \$1,863 a month.

He's told he has an option. He can downgrade his mother's accommodation. His mother is quite ill. He might be prepared to downgrade her accommodation because of the financial hardship that this will place on the entire family. But then he's told there's no room to downgrade her to a ward. So what choice does he have? He brings his mother home. Either he or his wife has to

take time off work, perhaps quit their job, at a time when they're trying to survive as a family, or he has to somehow magically come up with over \$400 a month to take care of his mother.

You're putting families into situations that are just breaking their hearts. We have seniors who are sitting there breaking down in tears because you're passing on these costs. Minister, you're supposed to have some kind of compassion. We're talking about seniors who have worked hard to build this province and this country and—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** —whom you are now just telling that there is no choice: they can downgrade their accommodation, even though there's no accommodation at a downgraded level, or they can simply pay more money to this government. It is clearly a tax on the infirm. It is penalizing—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** It is making victims out of helpless senior citizens. How can this government, of all governments, justify this insidious grab of money from our seniors and our sick mothers and fathers?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me say again that the member's description of the long-term care and the levels-of-care funding system is absolutely wrong. I'm aware of the case that he described—I read the article in the newspaper today—and let me say to him again that there will be one income-tested charge for accommodation. There will also be what is known as a comfort allowance so that nobody will have to pay their entire income, and the levels-of-care funding will be entirely determined on the needs of the person who is there and based on their income, not their assets. It will be a fairer system, it will be a clearer system, and it will be a system that makes sure we can continue to provide the care that people need where they need it.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** My question is for the Minister of Finance. I've recently been contacted by the township of Woolwich staff. This municipality will have extreme difficulty in meeting the requirements of your social contract legislation. The township employs 46 full-time employees, 36 part-time employees, and 115 volunteer firefighters. Of these 197 employees, only 17 people make more than \$30,000. Now, in order to meet the requirements of your bill, these 17 people will have to take an 18% or 19% pay cut.

This is a problem facing many other small municipalities across the province of Ontario. They are being required to meet their cost-saving objectives through reductions to the compensation paid to employees

making over \$30,000 a year, despite the fact that very few of their employees earn that much. Minister, what suggestions do you have for these smaller municipalities to enable them to meet the requirements of your legislation.

1430

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** We have been aware, since the social contract legislation was introduced, that there are some particular problems in some areas of jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, I have in my own constituency some small municipalities where this is a particular problem, and that's why the negotiations with that particular sector are still going on. We do need to resolve some of those problems.

**Mrs Witmer:** I'm afraid that your answer is going to be of little or absolutely no comfort to the municipalities that really are struggling very hard, I have to tell you, to meet the requirements of your social contract bill.

Most of these municipalities, already in their 1993 budgetary year, have reduced their staff complement. Can the previous cuts they have made be used towards achieving the social contract budget?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I appreciate the fact that when the expenditure control plan was introduced and that impacted on the unconditional grants to the various municipalities, those municipalities took action in accordance with those reductions, and it didn't have to involve public sector compensation.

The social contract legislation is designed to extract compensation from public sector compensation as opposed to other forms of service out there at the municipal level. Our intention, and I believe there's general consensus, is that if we're going to get our financial house in order, we need to reduce the level of compensation in the public sector. I don't deny that there are going to be some glitches in the system as we work it through, and that happens to be one of them, but that's one reason why we're sitting down with the municipal sector in trying to resolve some of those issues.

#### CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. On May 12, the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario submitted to you their report called Restructuring Resource Management in Ontario: A Blueprint for Success. As the minister will know, the report contains proposals and recommendations on how the government can fundamentally restructure delivery of natural resources management programs in this province, and in doing so save itself substantial amounts of money while not jeopardizing our natural conservation heritage.

Recently, I met with the chair and other members of the Credit Valley Conservation Authority to discuss this



proposal, and was impressed by the constructive approach to the problems of duplication etc. While I have some concerns about some of the suggestions, I feel that these problems do need to be addressed, and the report certainly represents, in my opinion, a valuable contribution to the discussions.

Can the minister indicate to the House his position with respect to this report and more generally with respect to the issues of integrating and streamlining the roles of the various government agencies and levels of governments involved in resource management in Ontario?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** I've held two meetings now with the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario, and we have received the report, which is called A Blueprint for Success. The report is helpful in some respects, although some of the savings that are claimed in the report, frankly, we find hard to substantiate, and we've asked the association to do some more work to substantiate the savings which it indicates are present.

We have a couple of other studies that we're looking at. The options which the association of conservation authorities presented, as I said, are helpful options and will be considered with the other options that we have before us as well.

**Mr Duignan:** I appreciate the answer from the minister. I want to know, what efforts has your ministry made to identify those areas where some changes could be made, and to begin to address some of the issues that the CAOs have raised and how governments can begin to work together with the CAO and other parties to come up with solutions to some of the issues raised in that report.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** We have invited the association of conservation authorities to meet with us again towards the end of July or August. We have asked them to consider again some of the specific points they have put forward in A Blueprint for Success and to consider again the cost savings which they indicate they believe are present.

We have also undertaken with the association of conservation authorities to convene some meetings with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Ministry of Environment and Energy to look at some areas where we can cooperate more fully in the future in terms of the delivery of services. I think, again, that the options that have been put forward by the association of conservation authorities, while not providing all the answers, give us some helpful options and we'll be exploring those options in the next four or five weeks.

#### RACE RELATIONS

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** My question is to the Attorney General. We have seen an

increase in the distribution of hate propaganda literature, an increase in active recruitment of our youth by white supremacy groups and neo-Nazi groups. We've also seen an increase in racially motivated acts and crimes in our society, and also some violent racist demonstrations.

Your government and its anti-racism initiatives are really awfully ineffective. You would agree on that. The reality is that your programs are not working. Given the situation, what alternative plans do you have to combat this racism that prevails in our society today?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** We have discussed this in this House before and have agreed, all three parties together, that we all deplore and are quite concerned about the rise in racist activities and that we know that there needs to be a many-pronged community response to this. The Minister of Citizenship has called together an anti-racism cabinet round table, which has only met once—

**Mr Curling:** It's not working.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** No, it isn't working yet—at which we decided very clearly at our first meeting that the issue of this kind of material and how we were going to react more effectively to it would be our first order of business, and we will move ahead with that.

The Solicitor General and I have been discussing and are prepared to meet with those who are expressing concerns about the enforcement of what laws we have, and we understand very much the kind of concern that people have around the apparent ineffectiveness of our current laws to curb this material. We share that concern.

In addition, as I said in this House, the federal-provincial-territorial ministers believe very strongly that if we do not couple hate and bias crime issues to sentencing in terms of the Criminal Code, all crimes under the Criminal Code, we will not be effective, and we have made that the first order of business at our fall meeting, once the consultation has been held with our officials as to how that can be accomplished in an effective way in the Criminal Code.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I can just say to the member that we share the concern. We're working in an inter-ministerial way and with our partners at the municipal level to do what we can to ensure that this is taken as seriously as you obviously take it.

1440

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** As the Attorney General will know, there is a demonstration being organized in my riding today, coordinated by the Tamil Ealam Society of Canada, which is bringing together thousands of Tamils across Metro to protest a series of three recent attacks that have been racially motivated, including one that unfortunately occurred in

my riding. These people are demanding action now. We appreciate round tables but we need action now.

I see from the almost-always-accurate Toronto Star that your officials are quoted as saying that they want to wait till they get a rock-solid case before prosecuting. Madam Minister, I'm asking you, what is rock-solid? How long do these people have to wait? We can be prepared to go ahead; we should be prepared to go ahead. We need action now.

Rather than having Michael Code fighting to prevent the release of the Grandview report, why don't you direct Michael Code to direct all of the prosecutors in this province to proceed with zero tolerance on hate crimes and to prosecute hate crimes now? There's a concrete action you can take today to help out on this issue, and I ask you to undertake to do it.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I must say that I wish members would refrain from using the names of civil servants in this place. We as elected officials are responsible, and I certainly am prepared to take the responsibility that is mine.

I should say to the member that I agree with his surprise that a member of our ministry would be quoted as saying we need a rock-solid case before we go forward, because, of course, that's not at all what I believe ought to be the standard. If indeed the police come forward and say they have reasonable and probable grounds to lay a charge, and they bring forward a case to us, obviously we would look at the strength of that case, as we do in most cases.

But I certainly would say to the member that my standard on these cases would not be anything rock solid. None of us, in taking anything into court, can be assured that we have a 100% possibility of getting a conviction. What we do need is to have the police bring forward those charges and do thorough investigations. The same story suggested that the police were confused as to whether they should be investigating. Of course they should be investigating. They should be investigating very vigorously.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** They should be bringing forward cases if they have reasonable and probable grounds to assume that a crime has been committed.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Finance. As you well know, Metro Toronto public school boards receive no provincial funding. Will you commit that any savings achieved through the social contract will be rebated directly to the Metro property taxpayers?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I'll refer that question to the Minister of Education and Training.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I'm not sure I heard the last part of the question because the Finance minister was instructing me as to my answer. I've said in the House before that we are working with boards that are in a negative grant position. I am quite sure and hopeful and optimistic that we'll be able to work something out with the boards that are affected.

**Mr Turnbull:** One of the great problems we're having on this side is that we've had various answers from various ministers on this particular question over a period time. I want to point out that the Fair Tax Commission, a commission which is costing the taxpayers of this province \$2.3 million, concluded in a recent report, "Relying on property taxes to finance education is regressive."

Clearly, if you force the Metro school boards to remit property tax dollars to the province, you're absolutely trashing the recommendation of your own very expensive commission. If you are going to not unequivocally say that you're going to rebate this to the property taxpayers, why are you ignoring the advice of your own property tax commission?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I understand the member's position, but I guess I would just say that if the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the Ottawa Board of Education were not part of the social contract process and, therefore, if money wasn't coming back to the province, just like it is from every other school board, that would mean an additional cost of 20%, 25%, 30% for the rest of the school boards across the province in terms of the contribution towards debt reduction at the provincial level.

I hardly feel that would be important, since the reason that the Metropolitan Toronto taxpayers and the Ottawa Board of Education get nothing in the way of grants from the provincial government is because they have a lot in the way of commercial and industrial wealth. Therefore, during difficult times, we must all share in the pain, and obviously Metropolitan Toronto and Ottawa have to as well. It wouldn't be fair to the students of the rest of the province if that weren't the case.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** My question is to the Attorney General. As you know, in the Niagara area, our community has been severely affected by violent crimes. As a member of the standing committee on the administration of justice dealing with victims' rights over the last four weeks, we have had the opportunity to listen to citizens' groups.

They are very concerned about the increase of violence in our society, about the treatment of victims and about justice for women. Groups such as CAVEAT—Canadians Against Violence Everywhere Advocating its Termination—Voices for Children's



Rights and the Coalition for the Safety of Our Daughters all made presentations and recommendations and we are presently writing a report.

We have seen the inadequacies of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board and we have heard about the inadequacies of the victim/witness assistance program. Madam Minister, what are you presently doing to make the justice system more responsive to the needs of victims?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I think all members should recognize how valuable our committee hearings are because they raise our consciousness about problems the citizens have, and clearly the number of questions around victims' issues in this House from members of that committee show it's an important aspect.

There are many things we need to do. We have announced an eight-point program that is directed specifically at trying to improve our responses to victims of crime.

With respect to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, even though \$2.5 million has been withdrawn from federal funding to that board, we've increased its funding by about \$1.25 million for the coming year and we have required it to make some changes in its process and its administration according to the kinds of recommendations that were brought forward by the victims' advisory panel. We expect that will change.

In terms of the victim/witness program, we have made a commitment that we will expand that program to all jurisdictions in the province as quickly as we can, as soon as we get funding.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** In order to get the funding, we will be charging a victim fine surcharge on provincial offences as well as the federal offences victim fine surcharge and dedicating that money to the expansion of victim services.

**Ms Harrington:** From what I have heard in committee, certainly these are going to be welcome changes, and I urge the minister to continue. This is very important to the people of Ontario. The government of Ontario, as we all know, is cutting spending by \$6 billion. My question to the minister is: How are we intending to finance these increased expenditures to help the victims of crime?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** One way will be the imposition of a provincial victim fine surcharge and the dedication of the current federal victim fine surcharge. We certainly have heard from judges and from others in the system that our lack of ability to dedicate those funds has meant that we have not had the revenues from victim fine surcharges that other provinces have had. Given our circumstances, we think it is quite useful for those who

perpetrate violent crime to understand the importance of the victim; indeed, for all those who commit crimes in our society, offences of any kind, to realize that it's not only the direct victim of those offences who suffers but the community as a whole. That is the rationale behind that.

But I agree with the member that we have had to work very, very hard to try and be sure that our expenditure control plan has not impacted on these services, which certainly require the kind of support that you advocate.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Would the minister tell us why her government is establishing gambling casinos in Ontario?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I thought the member was going to ask me about the Bread Sales Act today. I'm disappointed; maybe another time.

The province's decision to establish a pilot project of one casino in Windsor, Ontario, was based on several factors, as he well knows, one of which was that some border communities had requested that the government look at establishing casinos as a way to help counteract cross-border shopping. As you know, border towns were very hard hit.

As well, of course, the government was looking at new forms of non-tax revenue and at the same time noticing that other jurisdictions across Ontario and indeed in North America are looking at establishing casinos. There are many other factors as well, but Mr Speaker wants me to sit down now.

**Mr Bradley:** In view of the fact that the city of Detroit in its plebiscites has rejected casino gambling by rather overwhelming ways in the past but then in the last municipal ballot, which I believe took place on June 2, the vote was only 51% to 49% now opposed to casino gambling, it can be anticipated that the vote is due almost entirely to the fact that the province of Ontario says it's going to establish a casino in the city of Windsor. Can you tell me what possible justification you could have for ruining the reputation of Ontario, completely reversing the position of the New Democratic Party on this issue, inviting organized crime into our province, adversely affecting charities and the horse racing industry and, finally, playing to compulsive gamblers? Could you tell me what the possible justification can be when the only reason you have for doing it, that you're the only game in town and you can make money, is going to be lost in the next vote in Detroit, when they finally approve it?

1450

**Hon Ms Churley:** There are a lot of problems with some of the statements in that question. First of all, as

the member knows, gaming in general is a \$4-billion industry in Ontario; we have to keep this in perspective. There is horse racing, there are lotteries, there is charitable gaming, bingos. So this is hardly new to the province of Ontario.

One of the things I should say is that if Detroit does decide to go ahead with a casino, that was taken into consideration at the time it was decided to put a casino in Windsor. There are many advantages to Windsor. For one thing, the winnings aren't taxed here in Ontario and Canada, as they are in the United States. For another thing, Windsor is a safe city. I think people will want to come there, and we intend to make a very competitive casino in the Windsor area. As I said, we factored it in, and we feel the casino will be able to remain competitive.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and it pertains to the funding of waste management in the province of Ontario. As you're aware, I'm sure, Bill 7 is currently before the standing committee on general government, and many of the deputants who are coming before this committee are asking, where is the money going to come from to fund the expensive programs: the blue box program, the compost plants, the material recovery facilities, not even to mention the Interim Waste Authority, which is spending about \$35 million?

We have a regulation that requires municipalities to have a blue box program and a compost program, but they have no blueprint, no plan as to where the money is going to come from. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario has said that the current funding system is not sustainable.

Will you today stand up and tell us what plans you have for each sector—for the municipal sector, for the private sector, for the public through the user-pay system and for the provincial sector—or when those plans will be released—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr David Johnson:** —so that each sector will know how much it has to pay for waste management in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I believe the Minister of Environment and Energy has already answered the question regarding the support his ministry has given to the 3Rs program, so I'll refer it to him so he can answer the question over again.

**The Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Elston:** I'm having a bit of trouble here. There

seems to be some rise in energy as we approach debate time in the House.

There have been reports in the local press, notably the Toronto Star, that there is about to be an announcement by the government with respect to a major expenditure in areas of social assistance.

Mr Speaker, I would not stand and raise this issue with you except that, in this case, this release of information about increased expenditure comes on the heels of a demand to press forward to carry Bill 48 and other legislation which is designed to cut back in the expenditures made in this province. It looks like a supplementary on the budget, and I'm asking that the government House leader undertake that a statement will be made here in the Legislative Assembly first, because it affects our deliberations both on the passage of Bill 48 and also with respect to other expenditure control plans that have been forming part of the budget. It is, in my view, out of order to effect in any way increased expenditures in the budget without coming here first with a budgetary statement. I would ask that both compendia and other material be made available to us as legislators so that we finally make ourselves aware of what the real budgetary plan of the Minister of Finance is.

**The Speaker:** The member for Bruce will know that he does not have a point of order. However, it is something that he may wish to discuss with the government House leader and indeed with his colleague the House leader from the third party in the orderly conduct of the business of the House.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: During question period, I had posed my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who referred it to the Minister of Environment and Energy. The Minister of Environment was just prepared to stand and answer when you interjected, and he wasn't able to respond. Why the question was referred from the minister responsible to the Minister of Energy in the first place I'm not sure; at any rate, he was just getting to the point of answering my question when you wouldn't allow him to do that. I wonder if you would rule at this point, in view that the Minister of Energy is prepared to answer the question, that he can now give me the answer to my question.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** First, to the member for Don Mills: I appreciate his point of order. Ministers should know that if they wish to refer a question, that's simply what they should do and not attempt to provide a partial answer. Under the circumstances, I think it would be appropriate for the Minister of Environment and Energy to give his reply. I would ask all ministers to please simply refer questions if indeed that is what they wish to do.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. While it



is a bill under the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the program is a Ministry of Environment and Energy program and the funding comes from this ministry.

The member should know, as my colleague indicated, that I have already stated in the House that new programs will receive 50% funding from the province for the municipality, which has always been there, that in the second year we will provide 40% funding and in subsequent years 30% funding, and we will maintain that funding from the Ministry of Environment and Energy.

Having said that, I recognize that the cost to municipalities is very high and, very briefly, there must be a greater share of the cost of the blue box recycling program by those companies, those in the private sector that produce products that are disposable, whether they're products or packages. We are currently involved with the industry in discussions on how we can ensure that it provides a greater share of the cost.

#### MOTIONS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I have two motions I'd like to deal with this afternoon. The first one I have to seek unanimous consent on. It's a motion dealing with notice of the House regarding private bills and hearings in the standing committee on regulations and private bills.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

#### CONSIDERATION OF BILLS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that it's ordered that standing order 87 respecting notice of committee hearings be suspended for consideration of Bills Pr9, Pr23, Pr33, Pr42, Pr54, Pr55 and Pr80 by the standing committee on regulations and private bills on Wednesday 30 June 1993.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that notwithstanding standing order 96(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot items 19 and 20.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

1500

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to register my dissatisfaction with the Minister of Education's answer to my question today and would call for the late show tomorrow.

**The Speaker:** I trust that the member for York Mills will file the necessary document at the table.

#### PETITIONS

##### GAMBLING

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario: I have a petition addressed by a number of people from the area of Port Elgin, Ontario, asking that the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and in fact reciting several of the reasons that were used in the question by my colleague the member for St Catharines in a question to the minister today.

I have attached my signature to this petition, along with, just as a sample, Mary Pierson, Lillian Heard, Harry Schildroth, Kent Milroy and Lorna Caley, who are all residents of the Port Elgin area.

##### NATIVE HUNTING AND FISHING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas in 1923, seven Ontario bands signed the Williams Treaty, which guaranteed that native peoples would fish and hunt according to provincial and federal conservation laws, like everyone else; and

"Whereas the bands were paid the 1993 equivalent of \$20 million; and

"Whereas that treaty was upheld by Ontario's highest court last year; and

"Whereas Bob Rae is not enforcing existing laws which prohibit native peoples from hunting and fishing out of season; and

"Whereas this will put at risk an already pressured part of Ontario's natural environment,

"We, the undersigned, adamantly demand that the government honour the principles of fish and wildlife conservation, to respect our native and non-native ancestors and to respect the Williams Treaty."

There are 230 names on this petition. They're from Windsor, Sarnia, Guelph, Kingston, North Bay, Kenora, Midhurst, Phelpsston, Otterville, Barrie, Newmarket, Oshawa, Sharbot Lake, Perth and Waterloo, and I've affixed my name to it.

##### GAMBLING

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition here, like many others, on casino gambling.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from the introduction of video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

It has been signed by parishioners at St James the Apostle Church in Sharon and Christ Church in Holland Landing, and it has been forwarded to me by Rev Ruth Adams from St James the Apostle Church in Sharon. I have affixed my name.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education proposes to substantially modify the provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled by their downsizing, closing parts of or restructuring the schools, resulting in significant hardship for students, families, employees and the local community for the purposes of saving money; and

"Whereas the Sir James Whitney Parents' Association believes that the quality of education delivered today within the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled provides the lowest total cost option available while allowing deaf students to wholly develop within their own culture and to receive the best education possible,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"(1) Maintain the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled until an acceptable model from all interested parties has been developed; and

"(2) Empower local boards of trustees, as set out in model 5, to manage their own budgets within ministry guidelines and funding."

This is signed by several hundred persons in the Newmarket-Aurora area and I have affixed my signature thereto.

## COURT REPORTERS

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it reads as follows:

"Whereas open and public trials require an accurate record prepared by those trained for that purpose; and

"Whereas the proposed model of a clerk-monitor taping the proceedings, non-stop taping of each courtroom, even during recesses, and a typist transcribing proceedings which were not attended is inimical to the proper administration of justice in Ontario;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario Court of Justice maintain the use of court reporters to keep the record of all court proceedings."

It's signed by a number of individuals and I affix my name to it.

## HEALTH CARE

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"As the proposal under the government's cost-cutting measures regarding health care in Ontario will have a devastating impact on the availability and quality of health care in Kent county,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assem-

bly of Ontario that the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to the rational reform of Ontario health care systems through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

These are approximately 4,000 signatures. These petitions were established in doctors' offices throughout Kent county and also in the emergency rooms of the hospitals, and I do forward these petitions.

## GAMBLING

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition here signed by well over 100 people from the Port Hope area.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

## GO BUS SERVICE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 22 signatures from my riding. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Ontario as follows to object to the recent cuts to the GO Transit bus service for Woodbridge, Kleinburg, Nobleton, Bolton, Palgrave and Highway 9:

"Whereas this will be a major inconvenience to non-drivers; and

"Whereas it will have a negative impact on the local economy; and

"Whereas the lack of transit services will increase traffic, thereby increasing air pollution levels, at a time when all levels of government are making efforts to reduce pollution and encourage public transportation systems; and



"Whereas the cuts leave no alternative means of commuting in and out of Toronto during peak hours; and

"Whereas the lack of GO buses will force passengers, at one of the worst economic times in Ontario history, to incur an extra expense in finding another form of transportation,"

The petition is that the government of Ontario overturn GO Transit's decision and restore GO Transit service to Bolton and Palgrave.

I have placed my signature on this petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted with the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I'm very glad to affix my signature to this fine petition.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

The 42 people who signed this petition come from several places in our area, including Kingston, Glenburnie, Belleville, Shannonville, Bath and Harrowsmith.

#### BICYCLING SAFETY

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I have a petition signed by some 700 citizens of Ottawa-Carleton on behalf of the Ontario Coalition for Better Cycling. These people oppose the province's plan to introduce legislation to mandate the wearing of bicycle helmets. The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, support the voluntary use of helmets. We oppose the province's plan to introduce legislation to mandate the wearing of bicycle helmets."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

1510

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition.

"Whereas there is a shortage of affordable housing units in Ontario; and

"Whereas the shortage most affects individuals and groups facing discrimination, social and economic disadvantage, for example, racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants and refugees, first nations people, women, gay men, lesbians, seniors, youth, single parents and people with children, people with disabilities, psychiatric survivors and people on social assistance; and

"Whereas the Ontario Human Rights Code affirms that every person has the right to equal treatment in respect of occupancy of accommodation without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, family status, handicap or receipt of social assistance; and

"That any policy or factor which results in the exclusion of these people comes under prohibited grounds of discrimination and is illegal;

"Whereas people cannot afford to buy houses and are often excluded from lower-density neighbourhoods which generally are well served by community and educational and recreational services; and

"Whereas many thousand of home owners in municipalities across Ontario have created additional units in their homes that have not created a change in quality of life in their neighbourhoods; and

"Whereas tenants in such illegal units are not guaranteed legal rights and protections the tenants in legal units have, therefore creating two classes of tenants; and

"Whereas zoning is only supposed to control land and in practice it has created members of disadvantaged groups living within many neighbourhoods; and

"Whereas the zoning practices are exclusionary and a violation of rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Ontario Human Rights Code; and

"Whereas the province of Ontario has agreed to article XI of the International Covenant of Social, Economic and Cultural Rights in a treaty signed by Canada and 96 other nations, which recognizes that housing is a fundamental human right and an aspect which must not be discriminated against in housing of choice and location,

"Therefore, we petition the government of Ontario, in particular, the Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Housing, the Minister of Citizenship responsible for the Human Rights Code, to immediately put an end to the widespread violation of human rights across the province by amending the Planning Act so as to require all municipalities to permit the creation of additional rental units to meet the health and safety standards in neighbourhoods zoned as single family."

It's been signed by many, many people all across the area and I affix my name to this.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education proposes to substantially modify the provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled by either downsizing, closing parts of or restructuring the schools, resulting in significant hardship for students, families, employees and the local community for the purpose of saving money; and

"Whereas the Sir James Whitney Parents' Association believes that the quality education delivered today within the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled provides the lowest total cost option available while allowing deaf students to wholly develop within their own culture and to receive the best education possible,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of

Ontario as follows:

"(1) Maintain the current provincial schools for the deaf and learning-disabled until an acceptable model from all interested parties has been developed; and

"(2) Empower local boards of trustees, as set out in model 5, to manage their own budgets within the ministry guidelines and funding."

I've signed the petition.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition here sent to me June 1 of this year.

"To the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers the most cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law would result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

It's been signed by people like Donna Roy, Wayne DeJong, Edna Kane and many other people from as far away as Stouffville, Tillsonburg, Uxbridge and Gormley, and I've affixed my name to this as well.

#### CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food has decided to close Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the Veterinary Services Laboratory diagnostic laboratory at the college as of May 1, 1994;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"To reverse the decision to close CCAT and the VLS diagnostic lab located on Centralia's campus."

People from Dashwood, Goderich and also from Ms Coates's grade 1 class have all signed this particular petition. I have added my name to the petition and I support their concern about the closure of Centralia.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I beg leave to present the 19th report from the standing committee on government agencies and move adoption of its recommendations.



**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you wish to make any statement, Mrs Marland?

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I do not have any further statement or debate to make and I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mrs Marland moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### PAY EQUITY AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ÉQUITÉ SALARIALE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for third reading of Bill 102, An Act to amend the Pay Equity Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'équité salariale.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** I believe the member for London South was the last person who addressed the House on that issue and we were at the question and comments period. Are there any questions or comments to the member for London South's presentation?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: How are there to be questions or comments made if the member is not here?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any other members who wish to participate in this debate?

**Mr Elston:** Are you saying then that there can't be any questions or comments?

**The Deputy Speaker:** That's exactly what I'm saying. Are there any members who wish to participate in this debate?

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** We're debating now Bill 102, and this is the pay equity bill which the government has brought forward. One of the concerns I have about the way the government has presented this bill, and I've said this on other occasions, I've said this at committee, is that in fact the government is saying one thing and doing another. I had prepared extensive comments and I only have a half an hour to debate this, so what I would like to do with the time available is share with the House what the Ontario Nurses' Association has to say about Bill 102.

This just came across my desk today and I think it sums up very well the concerns and frustrations that I have, the concerns and frustrations that women across the province who are aware of what this government is attempting to do with Bill 102, the frustrations and concerns that they have, and I want to applaud the Ontario Nurses' Association as well as saying that I very much support their point of view.

This is what they have to say in their ONA News. That's their article and their newsletter that they send out to their members. I want to thank them for sending me their copy of the June 1993, volume 20, number 5.

1520

Their headline says it all. "Province Reneges on Pay Equity Promise. Amendments Erode Hard-Fought Gains, Says ONA." I quote:

"ONA is disappointed that proposed amendments regarding pay equity will effectively erode any possibility of ever achieving pay equity for its members under the legislation." The legislation that the Ontario Nurses' Association is referring to is Bill 102.

"The government's shocking proposal to postpone for another three years, until 1998, the deadline to achieve pay equity in the public sector is clearly unacceptable, says a January ONA submission to the standing committee on administration of justice concerning Bill 102, the Pay Equity Amendment Act."

I was a member of that committee and I, at that point in time, pointed out to the government that the Ontario Nurses' Association submission was a very clear and articulate evaluation and criticism that was very valid of the government's proposed Bill 102.

"In the submission, ONA reproaches the government for using the excuse of difficult economic times to justify removing established rights to retroactive pay to 1990, full pay equity to 1995 and obligations to maintain pay equity.

"Employers in the public sector were given five years to eliminate historic pay inequities, and now the government"—the NDP government—"is giving the public sector eight years and expecting working women to acquiesce.

"ONA says it wants the government to meet its original commitment to build upon the progress towards full pay equity made by the previous government.

"The failure to provide retroactive payments to 1990, and the additional one-year delay proposed for implementing pay equity using the proportional value and proxy methods means that, for ONA members, equitable pay by these routes will be unattainable." That's what this article says.

The Ontario Nurses' Association says that Bill 102 means, and let me quote again, "equitable pay by these routes," and those are proportional value and proxy comparisons under the NDP amendments, "will be unattainable" for the nurses of this province. Even if ONA were to find appropriate comparators, the government"—the NDP government—"is opening the door for limits on the obligation to maintain pay equity so that the wage gap"—that historic wage gap—"could be reinstituted." I believe that will be the result of the NDP legislation.

"By moving in the direction of Bill 102, this government has blatantly reneged on its promise to right historic wrongs in women's wages. These amendments do not merely delay pay equity, they begin to dismantle hard-fought gains."

I'll digress from the article for a minute, because one of the concerns I've had about the NDP's approach, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, is that it has said one thing about its support for pay equity and its determination to right historic wrongs and what Bill 102 actually does.

I'm going to continue with a quote from the Ontario Nurses' Association article of June 1993. Under the heading "Guiding Principles" they say:

"ONA strongly advises the government not to proceed with Bill 102 amendments that fail to measure up to the present standards:

"(1) The proportional value and proxy implementation process must be fully negotiable between the employer and the bargaining agent."

"(2) The pay equity adjustments determined by proportional value and proxy comparisons must be consistent with the act's original intent to take affirmative action to eliminate gender-based wage discrimination.

"(3) The first adjustments for the public sector must be made as of January 1, 1990, regardless of the methodology that is used.

"(4) Pay equity in the public sector, regardless of the methodology used, must be achieved by January 1, 1995.

"(5) Pay equity must be maintained.

"(6) Female job classes must be compared to male job classes on the basis of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions.

"(7) Gender-neutral comparison systems must be used.

"(8) Pay equity plans renegotiated on the basis of proportional value methodology, or because of changed circumstances, must not provide for lower adjustments than where otherwise achieved.

"(9) Access to proper hearings before the tribunal must always be available to parties to resolve disputes over interpretation of obligations under the act.

"(10) All disputes involving the Pay Equity Act must be resolved by the tribunal."

These 10 points are real concerns that the ONA has on behalf of not only its members but I believe all women who have had recourse under the pay equity legislation as it exists today and whose rights will be diminished under Bill 102.

The effects of Bill 102 the article goes on to debate and explain under the heading "Extending Deadlines."

"The proposed deadline extension for achieving pay equity in the public sector from 1995 to 1998 breaks the NDP government's pledge to working women. It also clearly goes against fundamental principles contained in the current law in which affirmative action is to be taken."

"Proportional Value Method"—this is what ONA has to say about that—"While ONA commends the government for retaining proportional value as an additional method of comparison, it is very troubled by a number of seemingly retrogressive features.

"ONA is extremely concerned that employers who should and could have completed pay equity using job-to-job will now have a further monetary incentive to postpone and avoid such comparisons. Public sector employers will be able to save three years of retroactive adjustment by finding a way around job-to-job comparisons and using proportional value effective January 1, 1993, rather than January 1, 1990.

"The government must clearly indicate to employers who have not yet posted job-to-job plans that they must still negotiate job-to-job pay equity in good faith, and comply with the time limits for adjustments, before switching to proportional value methods.

"ONA proposes that proportional value comply with the present effective date of January 1, 1990, and be achieved by January 1, 1995."

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think there should be some more people in here maybe to listen to this speaker. I don't think we have a quorum.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

1530

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mrs Caplan:** As I continue, I will be quoting extensively from the ONA News of June 1993, and I'm pleased that we now have a quorum so that I can continue. I give another quote:

"Also, ONA does not support the government's intention to prescribe proportional value methods through regulation. Any methods that might be prescribed certainly must follow the fundamental principles in the current law. The parties must retain the flexibility to fashion appropriate methods to suit their unique circumstances.

"The proposed definition for when pay equity is achieved using proportional value should be amended to delete the phrase 'representative group of male job classes' and be replaced with 'male job class or male job classes.' One or more than one male job class may be used by the parties for purposes of proportional value comparisons.

"ONA is pleased employers must negotiate with the bargaining agent any proportional value pay equity plan that is prepared or amended. Also, adjustments must be less than under job-to-job if employers redo pay equity using proportional value."



Regarding the proxy method, this is what the Ontario Nurses' Association has to say about the government's proposal:

"ONA rejects the government's amendments regarding proxy comparison methods. The proposed initiatives contravene the fundamental principle of comparing the compensation of female job classes to male job classes for pay equity purposes.

"Comparing female job classes to female job classes is unacceptable. ONA sees comparisons of female jobs to male jobs as essential in searching for pay equity. The parties must also retain full control over proxy comparison process.

"ONA reiterates that the parties identify the information required under the gender-neutral comparison system being used and request the information from proxy organizations.

"If a lack of comparator is revealed, another proxy organization would be selected from another schedule. A group of job classes should not be used if no comparator is found.

"The proxy organization must notify the parties of any wage increases for the proxy comparator for purposes of maintaining proxy pay equity. This approach is consistent with the fundamental principles in the law.

"ONA disagrees with the proposed delay of an extra year for the proxy method to be effective January 1, 1994. The employers in this sector should be treated the same as those using job-to-job compliance requirements.

"The proxy method must be effective as of January 1, 1990, and pay equity achieved by January 1, 1995.

"Postponing pay equity comparisons for the proxy method to 1994 (and for proportional value to 1993) likely means the wage gap has probably narrowed substantially between ONA members and their comparators, simply because of male wage freezes or other reductions since 1990.

"The result may well be that equivalent pay will have been reached by default, not by legislative principles."

Maintaining pay equity—this is what the Ontario Nurses' Association has to say about the NDP government's proposals on maintaining pay equity:

"The proposal that limitations might be prescribed for the current obligations to maintain pay equity is insulting and detestable."

Let me repeat that quote, because what I find most frustrating is that people often say to me, "The NDP wouldn't do that," and yet Bill 102, as described by the Ontario Nurses' Association, is "insulting and detestable" when it comes to their policy of maintaining pay equity. Let me quote again exactly what they say. This is from the Ontario Nurses' Association June 1993 article:

"The proposal that limitations might be prescribed for the current obligations to maintain pay equity is insulting and detestable.

"ONA has been involved in extensive litigation before the tribunal on the pay equity maintenance issue (Glengarry and Lady Dunn hospitals), and these hospitals are now judicially reviewing the tribunal's decisions. ONA will not stand by while the government subverts any progress it has made.

"The requirement to maintain pay equity must be dealt with by the tribunal, which has been given the power to interpret the legislation as it stands."

Regarding other amendments in Bill 102, as proposed by the NDP government, the Ontario Nurses' Association says this:

"ONA supports the amendment that parties may settle matters in writing where the tribunal is required to hold a hearing. Any such settlements should not be above the current law, and parties must not be able to fashion settlements that contravene present obligations.

"The Ontario Nurses' Association does not support amendments that would allow the inclusion of interests other than the immediate parties before the tribunal, other than the pay equity office in its current capacity of monitoring progress towards pay equity plans."

I've heard submissions before the standing committee. I've spoken on this issue before the House. I've told members of this House before that I've had the honour and the privilege of serving the members of Oriole since 1985. I had the privilege of serving in government, and in fact I had the privilege of serving in the government that brought forward landmark pay equity legislation which was seen as a framework for establishing legislation that would right those historic wrongs of gender-based discrimination in the workforce.

I've been told by numerous private sector employers that the obligation of 1% per year, even in difficult economic times, was achievable by any good manager, that with both attrition rates as well as increases in productivity, the obligation to achieve pay equity at the rate of 1% of payroll until pay equity was achieved was manageable, was reasonable and was fiscally responsible.

I know how difficult these economic times are, and I know that there are many employers who have already implemented pay equity and done so very successfully with their employees. What this legislation does is reward those employers who did not act in a responsible way. It rewards those employers who did not move under their obligations of the legislation to achieve pay equity in a responsible fashion that the legislation had established in a reasoned and responsible way, and it sends out exactly the wrong signal.

While I support in principle the kinds of legislation which would end gender-based discrimination, I must

say that I believe the Ontario Nurses' Association and others who have put forward thoughtful and reasoned arguments as to why Bill 102 is the wrong direction, and not only that, why they are so disappointed that it would be brought forward by an NDP government that, when they were in opposition, stated very clearly that they did not believe the legislation we brought forward, the Liberal government brought forward, was good enough, and that it did not achieve pay equity fast enough and that it was not the kind of legislation women of the province should feel achieved their aspirations for ending gender-based discrimination.

People of this province and the women of this province believed that, given the opportunity, the NDP would improve upon that Liberal legislation, and in fact what we know is that Bill 102 diminishes that legislation. We've heard it very clearly from the Ontario Nurses' Association, but we've also heard it from others, and let me tell you what some of the representations were that we heard at the standing committee that have convinced me that Bill 102 should not be supported and should not pass at this time.

The United Food and Commercial Workers said:

"The proxy method must allow for the comparison of female job class to male job class, and the adjustment should be the male job rate.... The proposed amendment"—the NDP amendment—"would allow a proxy organization to select a group of female job classes for comparison purposes. This process is highly subjective, unnecessarily complicated and would require extensive work by the proxy organization," which likely would just result in further delay.

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Unfortunately, I don't believe there's a quorum in the House at this time.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** I expected it from you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Check for a quorum, please. The member for Downsview, please, quiet.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

1540

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Oriole.

**Mrs Caplan:** I was quoting the United Food and Commercial Workers Union of Ontario and what it had to say on behalf of the women in its organization who would benefit from pay equity. They said:

"UFCW Canada urges the Ontario government to keep its original promise that pay equity adjustments in the public sector be paid in full by 1995. While fully cognizant of the financial situation of the provincial government, we urge it to lead by example. In citing its deficit as a reason for delaying implementation of this

aspect of the legislation, the government is sending out the wrong signal and undermining the importance of the legislation by allowing the injustice to continue."

There were many unions and others representing women. OPSEU, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, had this to say:

"We condemn the decision to add section 7.1 to this bill. The government is retreating from Bill 168, in which the implementation deadline for public sector wage adjustment was January 1, 1995. The current recession and lower revenues cannot be invoked as rationales for delaying pay equity adjustment.

"OPSEU has previously commended the Treasurer for his commitment to fight the recession and his unpromisingly keeping people at work and building up equity. This appears to be a government that would not force disadvantaged groups to bear the brunt of an economic downturn. Pay equity and wage protection were not to be used and treated as luxuries."

OPSEU then says: "We urge the government to recognize the contribution its employees make to the public. Do not impose on our members and other women the harsh tradeoff found in section 7.1 of Bill 102."

While the government is attempting to negotiate with its employees and 950,000 employees in the broader public sector, surely, if it was serious about pay equity, it could have found a way of incorporating and negotiating those principles at the tables, especially with its own employees at OPSEU, who were so clear about their support for this important concept and legislation that was in place. Their condemnation of the NDP proposals, I think, is clear.

But probably the criticism that had the greatest impact on me personally, and I believe fundamentally the greatest impact on women of the province who heard the submission, was the submission from the Pay Equity Commission of Ontario, the commission that was established under the Liberal legislation to act as a watch and guard on the implementation of pay equity and to act as an advocate for women.

Let me tell you what the Pay Equity Commission had to say about the proposals under Bill 102 that the NDP government is attempting today to implement. What they say is, and this is regarding subsection 8(5), limitations regarding maintenance:

"If this section of the bill is passed"—and I quote from the Pay Equity Commission itself—"the gains made in addressing pay inequity could be undone; in a few years' time, the Legislature may need to reconsider another pay equity act in order to recoup the lost ground that this section has the capacity to bring about."

I quote again: "It is one thing to ask them (the women whom the act benefits) to stretch full achievement of their rights for a few years; it is quite another



to ask them to give up a portion or all of what they have gained in the exercise of their rights."

I have reviewed very carefully Bill 102. I have expressed concerns at committee and in this House that what the NDP is doing is removing the protections of the existing pay equity legislation. As they're removing those rights and those obligations and those protections, what they are saying to women is: "We are expanding pay equity. We are making great gains in covering women who previously were uncovered. We have lived up to our commitments on pay equity." Nothing could be further from the truth.

We've heard from the Ontario Nurses' Association, which speaks for a profession that is female dominated and has been largely women over many, many years. We know what they are saying and what other unions that represent women and have been negotiating pay equity plans are saying. I find it interesting that the Ontario Nurses' Association had in fact negotiated an agreement with the Ontario Hospital Association on the issue of pay equity, and did so prior to this legislation coming into effect. I think the reason they did that was because they were very concerned that if they waited until this legislation was in effect it would have a negative impact at the bargaining table.

I hope the members of the government caucus will think very, very seriously about what they are doing as they pass Bill 102. They are establishing a precedent which retracts from the principles of pay equity, which retracts from the rights which have been given, which penalizes women, who have historically been discriminated against in the workplace simply because of their gender.

I know the communications plan of the government has said to their backbenchers, "This is the message we want you to deliver." But I would say to the members of the government caucus that if you simply spew the rhetoric which your government has suggested you say, then your constituents, and especially the women in your constituency, will know that you have been less than truthful as you tell them about Bill 102.

I will not be supporting Bill 102. I believe it is a piece of legislation that should not move forward. I say that with some regret as someone who was instrumental in the development of pay equity legislation. I say that as someone whose government was criticized by the NDP in opposition, criticized because we were moving forward in a way which the present government, the NDP, said was inadequate. I would say to the members of the NDP government that I think our pay equity legislation, while not perfect, will stand as a hallmark and a beacon across this country as an example of what should be left in place to achieve the end of gender discrimination in the workplace.

When people look at the amendments of the New Democratic Party, the New Democratic government, the

government of Bob Rae, when they look at what you have done to a progressive and positive piece of legislation, they will say: "We don't believe that a New Democratic government would have done this. We are ashamed that they have broken their commitment and their word to women and have diminished an excellent piece of legislation and set a precedent which will set back the issue of equal pay for work of equal value for the women of Ontario for decades."

I will not be supporting Bill 102, and I hope I will be joined by men and women not only in the opposition but by the government caucus as well.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I'd like to make some comments about the member for Oriole's remarks on this bill. The major observation I have with respect to this bill is the whole issue of pay equity, and it has designed pay equity towards women.

What an ironic time we're in at this particular point in time, when we're having social contracts and employment equity and we're having fears of deficits and people being laid off. It is very strange, because this whole policy is going to cost a tremendous amount of money. It's going to cost a tremendous amount of money to the private sector; it's going to cost a tremendous amount of money to the public sector.

1550

No one is against pay equity. Absolutely no one is against the principle of pay equity.

**Mrs Caplan:** Except the Tories.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, there may be a few members of the government side, but I think in general even they are in favour of the principle of pay equity.

The question is, of course, what is it going to do at this particular point in time, when the Treasurer and the Premier in absolute desperation are coming forward with unbelievably high taxes, unbelievable policy in cutting back with respect to the social contract?

At this particular time, it's almost an ironic—in fact, it's a sad twist of position to go through with this particular bill at this particular time. On the one hand, you're saying, "We're broke, we're dying." That's aside from the inequity, the issue between the private sector and the public sector. In the public sector, of course, the Treasurer is saying, "We're going to delay pay equity for a period of time," whereas in the private sector, "We're going to implement these policies now."

What a strange irony, when the whole principle of equity is fairness. It's not equity at all. It's unfairness, and that's what this bill is. It's unfair. When you look at the overall policy, if this government has an overall policy, of the plan of fairness towards women in this province, I would say at this particular point in time, with the job losses and the freezes, it's going to be unfair.

**Mr Perruzza:** I want to respond very briefly to the member for Oriole on her speech this afternoon.

But before I respond to her, I rather expected the remark that was made by the Conservative member, that, "If you can't afford it and if you can't afford to proceed with it, then this isn't something you should be doing." That's fair. That's a fair assessment, a fair comment to make if you really believe that. But I fundamentally believe that if you're doing work of similar value then you should be compensated on an equal basis.

This is where I can't understand what the member for Oriole was talking about. She spoke at length about how flawed Bill 102 is, the fact that Bill 102 isn't going far enough in redressing many of the inequities that exist out there; at the same time, she doesn't talk about some of the solutions.

We hear this day in and day out, primarily from the Liberals. At least the Conservatives are very clear and very direct: "You cut, you slash, you burn, and if that causes great pain out there, then so be it." That's their approach to it. But from the Liberals we hear a different kind of story: "The debt is too high. Reduce the debt. Don't touch the government payroll and reduce the government payroll. Don't do that." They say, "Keep that at the same level." They talk about specific programs. They say, "Spend more money on these programs." And when it comes to taxes, they were the tax kings of Ontario, but they say, "No new taxes; don't increase taxes."

Mr Speaker, that's a very, very confusing message indeed, so I would ask you to ask them to come clean with us on what exactly they mean on many of these programs.

**Ms Poole:** First of all, I'd like to commend the member for Oriole on a very articulate and well-presented speech today, in which she documented very clearly some very major flaws in Bill 102.

I know if the member for Oriole had had time, in addition to letting us know what the Food and Commercial Workers union had said, what the Ontario Nurses' Association had said and, as well, the Pay Equity Commission, she also would have given some quotes from the Canadian Union of Public Employees, because it also was very critical of major takeaways that this piece of legislation, Bill 102, did to the women of this province.

I'll quote from CUPE. They said:

"The bill also delivers major takeaways which were never part of the pay equity legislative agenda.

"We urge your committee to support the deletion of those parts of the bill which take away existing pay equity rights and weaken what we currently have in place.

"Section 2 of Bill 102 adds a section to the Pay

Equity Act which represents a serious takeaway of pay equity rights which have been established under the current law."

That is the law that was brought in by the Liberal government in 1987. It was adjudged by many jurisdictions that it was the most progressive pay equity legislation in the world.

To continue with some of the comments from CUPE, it said:

"It is unfair and unjust for the government to now decide that it should have the right to delete its direct pay equity responsibilities. This represents a takeaway of existing rights....

"Bill 102 makes two references to putting limits on the maintenance of pay equity. This also represents a major takeaway of existing rights.... Section 6 of Bill 102 would allow cabinet to water down maintenance of pay equity. Subsections 22(1) and (2) allow this to be retroactive. This is a major takeaway of rights."

How can we support this legislation when it's a major takeaway of women's rights?

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** I would remind the members opposite that the pay equity bill came through the Liberal government, it's true, but was on the accord as one of the requirements when we put the Liberals in power in 1985. I would just remind them of that.

I would also remind them, on comments on Bill 168, which has been mentioned today, that it is true that in Bill 168 the expiry date for the plan was January 1, 1995, and then after a year of continued negotiations and discussions on the whole definition of "proxy" and how the proxy method was going to work and also, in conjunction with that, finding after a year that we were in financial distress, Bill 102 did extend it to 1998. There's no question that's true and certainly unfortunate. However, in these hard times, we still think pay equity, for the member from the Conservative Party, is so important that we are continuing it.

I would say to the member for Oriole that Pay Equity Advocacy and Legal Services and the Equal Pay Coalition, especially the latter group, which has the broadest base of representation and supports the legislation—both groups have written to either the Minister of Labour or the Premier demanding that this go through and urging that it be proclaimed by July 1, given the contents of the legislation.

I would also say that the ONA, which was quoted extensively by the member opposite, is the only group throughout the entire week of presentations we had that, when asked by the Liberals whether or not they should pass this legislation, said no. So they are making a decision that the 400,000 women in this province who are affected by Bill 102 would not get it.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for



Oriole has two minutes to make a response.

**Mrs Caplan:** I think one of the things that bothers a lot of people who watch this House is that often members stand in their place and are not only quite selective in what they have to say, but the problem with what the member for Sudbury has had to say—I was a member of the committee. I heard very clearly what was said. I've placed on the record what I believe is extremely important, because what we heard from deputation after deputation before that committee was that this legislation is regressive, that it takes away rights from women, that the government has said it's going to do something which in fact this legislation does not do. For her to stand in her place and talk about how this legislation is some panacea for the women of the province of Ontario is dead wrong, and the women of this province resent that.

I would say further, in the last minute I have, that we know the Tories have opposed pay equity from the time it was brought forward in this House. I've listened to their speeches. We know where Mike Harris and the Tories stand on this. They believe that women should continue to endure gender-based discrimination. They are opposed to pay equity in principle. They voted against this bill in principle. We know where they stand.

This is now a debate about whether or not this legislation is going to do (1) what the NDP government said they were going to do and (2) what they say this bill is designed to do. It neither does what they said they were going to do, nor does it improve the position of women in this province when it comes to pay equity.

This bill is not deserving of going forward, and I'm pleased and proud to stand in my place today to quote those people who are familiar with this bill and to alert the women of this province that they have been once again betrayed by Bob Rae and his NDP party and his NDP government on the issue of equal pay for work of equal value for the women of this province. Bill 102 does not help women; it hurts women.

1600

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Tilson:** I'd like to make a contribution to this debate with respect to the Pay Equity Amendment Act, 1993.

Mr Speaker, as you know, this bill replaced Bill 168, which received first reading on December 18, 1991. This bill introduces all of the same amendments as the previous bill, with a few additions and changes.

As I have indicated in some of the responses to other speakers on this whole topic, notwithstanding the comments that were just made by the member for Oriole, I don't believe anyone is opposed to pay equity. I really don't believe that, in principle, anyone is opposed to that. The question is, how are we going to implement it? Do we have a plan? Do we have a set of

priorities? Obviously, I'm concerned when this bill is brought forward to be implemented at this particular time.

We do have the debate of Bill 48, which is the subject of the social contract. We've got everyone in the civil service all upset, notwithstanding the fact that the women in the civil service are upset with the extension of the time when they're going to get equity until 1998. Now they're getting even more upset with the whole issue of what this government is doing with respect to the social contract.

We have the topic of the inequities that exist with respect to women in the social contract, and there are several of them which I'd like to speak of in comparison to what Bill 102 is trying to do.

Bill 102 is attempting to create a form of equity for women in this province in the pay scale that they're receiving, yet the government seems to ignore the fact that the whole issue of extending pay equity to the public service has been extended until 1998. Some 420,000 women are now going to have to wait three years for pay equity. What a strange system we have when we're talking about equity, when we're talking about equality. It's as if some women are more equal than others. Some women have more rights than others. That shouldn't be. Everyone should be treated the same.

Even this New Democratic government, when it was in opposition—I must confess, I don't respect a lot of their philosophies but I respect their statements, which I must say since they've come to government have been contradicted in many ways; not in all aspects, but in many aspects. It has given the people of this province, the supporters of the New Democratic Party, grave concern. Bill 102 is a prime example. Women are concerned about the inequities that are being created by Bill 102, by Bill 48 and other such pieces of legislation.

Obviously, the extension of the law was to thousands of women in the broader public sector who weren't already covered because they work in facilities, and that includes people in hospitals, day care centres. These women won't get full pay equity until 1998 instead of 1995 as was originally promised. As has been stated by speaker after speaker in this debate, the women in this sector feel insulted.

Why are we treating those women differently from other people, particularly when we look at the people in the private sector? For the people in the private sector, the implementation with respect to pay equity, the private sector companies are required to begin by making pay equity adjustments according to the following schedule: The first pay equity adjustment, January 1, 1991, is for 500 plus; January 2, 1992, 100 to 499; January 1, 1993, 50 to 99, and January 1, 1994, 10 to 49.

It is a strange way, particularly when the parliamen-

tary assistant stands in this place saying: "Well, the government's in dire straits. We can't afford it. We can't afford to give pay equity to the women in the public sector, so we're going to delay it until 1998." If it's good enough for the private sector to have it now, why isn't it good enough for the people in the public sector to have it now? So that's one example of inequity that's being created by a bill entitled "pay equity."

The second example is the pieces of legislation that are coming out, whether it be employment equity or whether it be the social contract. There are inequities in these pieces of legislation.

For example, it's been made quite clear in the medical profession that there are more and more women who are wishing to become doctors, and there is a certain amount of prejudice towards the new doctors who are entering into the profession because they're trying to put a cap on the number of doctors who are entering the medical profession. Quite clearly, the medical profession and the people of this province are concerned.

There was an article that came out in the *Globe and Mail* of June 23 that really set forth many of the concerns of the medical profession, which ties up to the whole issue of inequity towards women. It talked about a brief that had been presented that talked about how more and more patients are demanding female physicians and the increase in the numbers of women doctors. In other words, in the last number of years there are more and more women who are entering the medical profession, who wish to become medical practitioners.

In quoting from this *Globe and Mail* article of June 23, which in turn is quoting this brief: "Whereas women represented fewer than 1 in 10 first-year medical students in the late 1950s, this proportion has risen steadily to exceed 4 in 10, which is 45.4%, as of 1991-92," said the brief. 'If controls on physicians tend to target on younger doctors, the proportion of female physicians will not reach a level high enough to meet the relatively new phenomenon of female patient demand.'"

So I don't really think that when the government says, "Oh, what a great idea; we're going to have pay equity to improve the plight of women," and yet it comes forward with contradictory legislation; contradictory legislation in the social contract that says that part-time workers—the general principle is they may or may not be exempted under the subject of the social contract.

Generally speaking, there are more and more women who are part-time workers, who are workers in a job-sharing capacity in business today and throughout the working world. Many, many women work only several days a week and the rest of the time they spend at home with their children, or they do it to supplement their income.

It's difficult to understand that these people are going to be penalized under the social contract, because as I understand the social contract, what that means is that the principle of—they will work out what someone who is working part-time would receive if that job was full-time. In many of those situations, women who are working under \$30,000 would be extended beyond the \$30,000 range, which therefore would create major problems with those people.

So I would hope the government, before proceeding with this piece of legislation, would look at the inequities that are being created in the public and the private sector as well as the inequities that are being created towards women in the social contract legislation.

There are inequities with respect to children's aid societies. There are inequities between public and private enterprise in all of those areas. Women in the public sector will face a delay on the implementation of pay equity. So you go throughout our entire society and we're finding inequities with respect to women.

There is the other issue that, whether it be universities or municipalities or other groups, they were promised certain amounts of funding for this government to bring forward pay equity, and that has not happened. So the question is, where are these transfer partners going to get their funds? They're going to have to cut from something else.

An interesting article—and I'm sure this is just one of many that came out of a recent copy of the *Toronto Star*, I believe it was. I don't have the date of this, but it was several days ago, and it talked how Metro pays out for equity. I'd just like to quote the few opening paragraphs.

It says: "About 6,000 of Metro's 14,000 employees received cheques worth \$27 million yesterday in a retroactive pay equity settlement that dates back to 1990.

"The settlement comes under a six-year-old provincial law that required employers to have pay equity plans in place by January 1, 1990."

Then it goes on to talk about the situation in Metro.

1610

All of this is admirable. There's no question that the salaries of women have been below the salaries of men for eons, and that has to change. The question is, what's the impact? What impact is that going to have on particularly the social contract discussions? We all know that the provincial government only has so much money to pay, because it's saying to its ministries: "We're going to have to cut back. We're going to have to cut back on programs, we're going to have to cut back on hiring, we're going to have to cut back on this." The same goes for the municipalities. So there are only so many dollars to go through the system, no matter what level of government or what level of transfer agency



that you have. Where is the money going to come from? What jobs are going to be lost? What other effects are going to develop as a result of pay equity?

I know the argument that comes forward, particularly from many of the women's groups in particular. They say, "If you don't do it now, when are you going to do it?" That's a very good question. There's no question it's a very good question, but these same women are going to end up losing jobs, the very same people who are receiving benefits by this pay equity legislation. Many of them will lose their jobs because there won't be the money available to pay them, whether it be in private enterprise or whether it be in the public sector. I really question whether or not the government has thought through this process at this particular point in time.

I attended a couple of the days of hearings with my friend from Wellington when we heard presentations made by different groups, and one of the topics that was raised was an article that came from the Toronto Star. I'd like to quote extensively from this because there were many questions that were asked from this article from Donna Laframboise, I think her name is, from a Toronto Star article of December 7, 1992.

There are many questions which this journalist asked and which I posed at the hearings, and yet we didn't get sufficient answers from the government or any of the people who were supporting this legislation.

The comments from this journalist were: "This year alone," which of course would be 1992, the year the article was written, "more than 500 jobs have disappeared from Ontario's economy each week," and I suspect that since that time even more jobs have been lost. "Because tax revenues have fallen short of predictions, our provincial deficit has continued to grow. Our hospitals are in debt and our universities are cutting back."

This was before the social contract, this is before that last dreadful budget was put forward by this Treasurer, this was before the announcement that the deficit in this province could increase to \$17 billion. This was before all of that. So if we thought things were bad then, guess what they are now.

Carrying on with this article, the journalist said: "Many private companies are stretched to the breaking point, entrepreneurs are beginning to wonder whether they should continue pouring time and energy into businesses that aren't making money, and most large organizations declared a hiring freeze a few years ago."

That probably accurately describes the mood of private enterprise in this province. We're in difficult times. No matter which town or city or village that you go to in this province, this economy is terribly weak, for whatever reason. It's not all the reason of this government. It's the reason of the policies of all governments

of the worldwide recession, and that's the fact of this economic climate.

The journalist continues by saying, "In such an economic climate, some difficult questions must be asked," and these are some of the questions that I put to the delegations and to the members of the government side of the committee to answer, none of which really received proper answers.

"For example, is it wise to enforce a pay equity timetable that would end up hurting some of the most vulnerable working people in the province? What should our government's first priority be: increasing the salaries of people who are lucky enough to have jobs or creating new jobs for those who are unemployed?"

That is a good question. We have a very high, increasing unemployment rate in this province. We know that businesses have so much money, which is declining, to pay their employees, and yet this, at this particular time, is going to mean that certain employees—yes, the women—are going to receive more funds as a result. But what will it do? This journalist is quite right. There's no question that it will not help the unemployment of this province.

"To be sure, it's difficult not to have sympathy with the hundreds of thousands of women who will now have to wait up to three more years for pay equity. But it's worth noting that it's against the law for an employer to reduce anyone else's salary in order to achieve pay equity within a particular establishment." This is another question. "Therefore, with limited dollars available, there's a good chance that organizations compelled to institute pay equity at this time will have to lay off some employees."

Is that a possibility? I guess we just have to follow common sense. We all know the businesses in our ridings. We all know the difficult times that they're going through. We all know what their budgets are and that the amounts of money that they're going to have to spend as a result of pay equity are going to tip the scales. What's that going to do? Men and women will be laid off. That's what it's going to do.

Continuing on with this article: "This is a disturbing prospect for at least three reasons. First, many of these laid-off workers would be forced to apply for unemployment insurance, a social program...under severe strain." I cannot believe that anyone in this House will not acknowledge the fact that because of pay equity at this particular time, at this particular time of the recession, jobs will be lost.

Why do I think that? Because the government thinks that. They've extended pay equity for the public sector until 1998. The parliamentary assistant just said a few moments ago in this House that because of the fiscal problems of this province, that extension is needed. We must wait until 1998. Yet it's okay to proceed with the

private sector of this province when businesses are going broke and people are losing jobs. Hence, the social insurance problem, the unemployment insurance problem, is going to become even more under a greater strain.

Continuing on with the article: "Second, since those with the least seniority tend to be laid off first, there's a good chance that visible minorities would be over-represented among the casualties." Isn't that a strange statement, which I believe is true, particularly when we're on the eve of debating employment equity, that dreaded quota bill?

The very people whom this government is trying to protect are going to be affected in a dastardly way by this bill. They are going to be the first who are going to be laid off, the visible minorities. "In other words," the article says, "in the name of enforcing pay equity, we might be undermining much of the progress that has recently been achieved through affirmative action programs."

This concise statement of the concerns of this bill is accurately put forward, I believe, by this journalist, and I'd recommend that all members of the House, particularly members of the government, read it before you vote on it because it does set forth concise reasons as to why this may not be, at this particular point in time, the right time to bring forward this legislation.

She goes on: "Third, young people, some of whom have large student loans looming over their future, would also be extremely vulnerable to layoffs. Since there are already grave concerns about the high level of unemployment among our youth and the despair this is engendering within the generation, do we really want to contribute further to this problem?"

Then she says, "There aren't any easy answers, of course." I sympathize with the government. I believe they're genuinely trying to solve an inequity problem, an inequity problem that's existed for years from all governments and all aspects of our society, going back for a considerable period of time. I believe that. However, I don't think that when you look at all of the effects that this bill's going to have, you should be bringing forth this bill at the very time you're bringing forth a social contract which is going to say, "Let's cut back on our expenditures. Let's cut back on a whole slew of things." Not only are we starting to spend more money than we can afford, but we're going broke over it, not only government but in private enterprise.

1620

"There aren't any easy answers, of course," the journalist says. "And, to be fair, women performing low-wage jobs such as child care—which appear to have been historically undervalued precisely because they're done by women—are entitled to ask how long they're expected to subsidize the rest of society."

That is a very true statement. Again, it gets back to my introductory comments on the inequities of pay equity, particularly in the child care sector, that we're going to have a group of women that is going to be treated, hopefully, fairly and another group that is not, and the child care workers, which services are generally completed by women, are being treated unfairly.

That's only a portion of this article that I would recommend people of this House address themselves to before they vote on this legislation.

The member for Wellington, who is in the House today, sat with me on the committee and played an active role in the committee and in the various debates at different stages of this bill, and he raised a number of questions which I would like to ask again.

I know he's asked it probably at least twice, maybe more, at different stages of these proceedings, but the member for Wellington tabled a motion to get additional information on the cumulative costs associated with the implementation of pay equity. Interestingly enough, and the member for Oriole should listen to this, that motion was defeated. The Liberals voted against that motion, which is very strange.

The motion stated eight points that were given by the member for Wellington, really eight questions. We wanted answers, the member for Wellington and our party wanted answers, to the following questions, and the motion stated:

"Would the Minister of Labour provide the committee members with the following information:

"First, the annual pay equity adjustment costs for the Ontario public service for the years 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993." To date we have no answer to that information.

Secondly, we wanted to know the projected annual pay equity adjustment costs for the Ontario public service for the years 1994 to 1998. The government has no idea.

Thirdly, the member for Wellington wanted to know the company name and the total amount paid for any consulting services that the government acquired to assist the development of pay equity plans for the Ontario public service. Well, if the government knows, it hasn't told us yet, and I doubt if it will.

Fourthly, the member for Wellington asked the question as to the annual pay equity adjustment costs for the broader public sector with a breakdown for school boards, hospitals, municipalities, colleges and universities for the years 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993. This information is most reasonable, particularly with the whole subject of the social contract and the demands of this NDP government for restraint.

Fifthly, he asked the exact dollar amounts transferred from the government to school boards, hospitals, municipalities and colleges and universities to assist the



broader public sector with pay equity adjustments. We know that the universities and the colleges have said over and over, "We're not getting the funds that were promised. We're not getting the funds that were promised by this government to implement pay equity. They promised these moneys but they haven't given them to us, so it has to come from somewhere else," which means the quality of education in this province is going to be affected by the principles of pay equity.

Sixthly, the member for Wellington wanted to know the projected annual pay equity adjustment costs for the broader public sectors with a breakdown for school boards, hospitals, municipalities and colleges for the years 1994 to 1998.

Seventhly, he wanted the estimated pay equity adjustment costs for private sector employers with 500 or more employees for 1991, 1992 and 1993 and, finally, the member wished to know the estimated pay equity adjustment costs for private sector employees with 100 to 499 employees for 1992 and 1993.

There has been no information given by the Ministry of Labour to date and since the hearings and since this motion was given, which was voted against by the Liberal Party and the government. I think they are reasonable questions to ask. Why are we proceeding with this legislation when we don't know the answers to that information? Why? What have you got to hide?

The total cost of Bill 102: This was included in a 1992 budget. There was a commitment to spend \$285 million in 1992-93 to implement pay equity in the broader public sector. Since Bill 102 postpones the introduction of the two methods of job comparison, the government has revised its estimate to \$240 million. Yet, if you read the 1993 budget, do you know what it says? It says that equity funding will grow to \$448 million. That's an increase of \$208 million.

Interesting figures, particularly when you also look at the anticipated job losses that are being effected by the expenditure control program in all sectors, whether it be municipalities, health care—I'd just like to run through some of those things—if you realize the job losses that are going to be effected by the savings that are anticipated in this government's plans for the future at the same time as it's roaring through with pay equity.

Municipalities: The savings plan of \$190 million, the anticipated job impact is 1,500 to 2,000 people. Health care including hospitals: The anticipated savings plan is \$560 million; the anticipated job loss in that sector is 1,800 to 2,400 people. That's the anticipated job impact. OHIP, which includes physicians: The 1993-94 savings plan is \$485 million. The social services—with schools, the savings plan is \$290 million. The anticipated job impact is 700 to 900. Colleges and universities: \$85 million, 800 to 1,000, and so on.

The job losses that are being anticipated by the

savings plan are rather astounding, yet we're proceeding with pay equity, which is going to affect probably more women than men. Some women will get their pay equity, but there are going to be an awful lot of women who, for some unjustifiable reason, are going to lose their jobs. It's rather astounding again that we're talking about the whole issue of equity, the whole issue of equality in this province with respect to women and how we're treating them.

Just to talk again about the promises that were overturned by the government towards some of the partners, particularly municipalities and universities, the president of the Council of Ontario Universities, Dr Peter George, said, as an example of broken promises:

"We were promised reimbursement for the cost of implementing provincial pay equity legislation. The money the Treasurer is now pledging is mere tokenism. It will not even partially meet the substantial costs of implementing the plan and adjusting employees' standards."

I have grave concerns as to the support of this legislation. I will not be supporting this legislation. I support the principle of pay equity, but I don't think you've thought it out. I don't think you've thought of all the various serious implications it's going to have to the women of this province, to the visible minorities you talk about in other pieces of legislation, to the public servants and to private enterprise. Why would you invest in this province when you add up all these pieces of legislation and the terrible effect they're having?

I would strongly recommend that the government members in particular take a second look at this legislation as to whether they will support it. Pay equity will cost the New Democratic government \$240 million this year. By 1998 Ontario will be spending \$1 billion a year in narrowing the wage gap between men and women.

1630

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and/or comments?

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I'd like to compliment the member for Dufferin-Peel on his fine presentation this afternoon on Bill 102, the pay equity bill. Even though the member has asked the members opposite in the government to reconsider their position, I expect this bill will in fact be passed into law.

I want to put a couple of points on the record, even though I'm not going to speak in a full speech with respect to this bill at third reading. I already did at second reading.

No one is opposed in this House to equal pay for equal work or equal pay for work of equal value. That's a given. Everyone supports that principle.

The member for Dufferin-Peel talked about a motion that I put forward during the course of those committee

hearings. We were trying to get a full accounting of what pay equity was costing and we were unable to get that full accounting. I have severe reservations about voting on a piece of legislation that will expand government spending to the degree that I don't fully comprehend or understand because that information is denied to me.

Secondly, you look at the interesting irony of this situation. The government's talking about a social contract, the need to roll back the overall compensation of the Ontario public service and the broader public sector, roll that total amount back about 5%, and at the same time we're looking at a bill that will increase compensation for some employees in the Ontario public service and broader public sector. It appears to be a curious juxtaposition of events, because on the one hand you may be increasing the pay packets of some, certain employees of the government, only to lay them off within a few months because you can't afford to pay the increase that you've just given them. So that's a concern.

Also, there's the issue of fairness. We've seen with this bill the government giving itself an additional extension to fully implement pay equity—that's one of the main principles of the bill—yet it has not given the same consideration to private businesses, many of which are in serious financial difficulty and of course facing exactly the same economic difficulties the government is facing. So that's still a very serious concern.

**Ms Poole:** I would like to follow up the member for Dufferin-Peel's comments on pay equity and the cost of pay equity.

One of the distressing things about this legislation was that the government could not give us estimates of what it would cost.

In fact, when we were in the standing committee on the administration of justice back in January, Mr Tilson had very specifically asked the deputy minister, "What would this legislation cost?"

This question had been asked a number of times and we were starting to get a little frustrated because we couldn't get an answer.

Mr Tilson specifically said, "Can you provide this committee with the cost to the government of pay equity, to implement pay equity from 1987 to now?"

The response from Mr Thomas went all over the map, but it really didn't tell us the bottom line of what it cost and specifically what it was going to cost in the future.

Mr Tilson said: "I'm going to ask the question again. I know it was asked, but it seems logical. You're getting us into something and you must have some idea of what it's going to cost the taxpayer of this province to implement these pieces of legislation."

Then Mr Tilson said, "What's it going to cost next

year?" The answer from Mr Thomas was three words, "I don't know."

Now, we were at committee discussing legislation with potentially enormous cost ramifications, yet the ministry could not tell us. They could not give an estimate of what it was going to cost. The minister didn't know. The deputy minister didn't know. Quite frankly, that was rather distressing.

Even for those of us, as in the Liberal caucus, who support pay equity in principle, the bottom line is we wanted to know: Had the government thought this out, what it was going to cost, what we could afford and how it could be brought in? That was missing from this legislation.

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** It was a pleasure listening to what Mr Tilson had to say when he was saying that he sympathizes with the government for having to rectify the mistakes of what other governments have done. Of course we have to rectify the mistakes; 42 years of Conservative rule and there was never a good time for pay equity. Why? We had boom time, we had downtime, but there was never a good time for pay equity at that time, not just because it wasn't a social issue at the time; it was because the commitment was not there.

People are asking, "What is the cost?" I say, "What is the cost going to be if we don't start to implement the program?" If the cost right now is going to be something, imagine what it will be in a few more years, or even in another 10 years when the other parties finally get around to saying, "Yes, it's time for pay equity."

If we put more money into the hands of working people, it stands to reason that with more income, these people will have a lot more money to spend, and when people spend money, obviously the economy continues to grow. When people start to buy goods, to buy products, that has its spinoff in other jobs so the economy can begin to grow.

As far as the rhetoric coming from the other side is concerned, it's obvious they don't believe in pay equity. To stand up and say, "Everyone in this House agrees with pay equity," is just a joke. If you really, honestly and truly do believe in pay equity, then put your mouth where your feelings are. Start voting with what you're really saying. Don't try to hide the facts with some political rhetoric that, "Yes, we believe in it, but this is not the right plan, this is not the right time."

We've waited for so long for the right time, I don't think we can spend another five or six years of inactivity from the other side.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? If there are none, the honourable member for Dufferin-Peel has two minutes to make a response.

**Mr Tilson:** Some of the responses I won't even



bother to comment on.

I honestly believe this government is trying to solve a problem. They talked about it in the past before they got into government. They did express a concern. We've all expressed a concern, notwithstanding particularly what the member for Guelph has said.

The fact of the matter is that this government has no idea what this plan's going to cost. It has no idea as to the effect it's going to have on both the men and women of this province. It has no idea as to the effect this bill is going to have on the general economy of this province. In short, it has no plan, hence the social contract. The social contract, Bill 48, is coming along and saying, "We've got to cut back."

I think the real issue this government has not addressed—nor have a lot of governments, including Conservative governments of 10 years ago, and I can't answer for them. I'm simply saying that I'm a member of this Progressive Conservative opposition and I believe we can do the job better than you can.

I would only quote, in the few moments I've left—it's a quote from the Peterborough Examiner of this past January that talks about it: "Pay equity, if not an anachronism, is an expensive, time-consuming and cumbersome answer to a problem of diminishing proportions. It is also a problem that the rule of equal pay for equal work began easing long ago."

The real problem, as has been pointed out by the Peterborough Examiner, is the value of rooting out pure prejudice and I don't believe this bill is solving that, particularly the problems that have been caused: The comparisons between the private and the public sectors; the problems that are being caused specifically in the issue of the social contract and the inequities being caused in the social contract.

I hope that before this vote is taken, this government would address that issue.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? If there's no further debate, does the honourable parliamentary assistant wish to conclude?

**Ms Murdock:** In conclusion, I'm not going to be very long. I just want to say I thank everyone in the House for their participation. It is a long time for this to be going on, so I'm very happy to say it is now concluded and third reading is complete. I am pleased that 400,000 women will have the legal right to pay equity once this bill is passed.

**The Acting Speaker:** Ms Murdock, on behalf of Mr Mackenzie, has moved third reading of Bill 102. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried.

1640

# RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LA TAXE DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL

VEHICLE TRANSFER PACKAGE  
STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT DES LOIS  
EN CE QUI CONCERNE LES DOSSIERS  
DE TRANSFERT DE VÉHICULES

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of the following bills:

Bill 32, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail

Bill 34, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act and the Personal Property Security Act in respect of Vehicle Transfer Packages / Loi modifiant le Code de la route et la Loi sur les sûretés mobilières à l'égard des dossiers de transfert de véhicules.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** At the end of the debate, the member for Markham had the floor. As he is not here in the House, we will move to further debate.

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I think I owe it to the public that's watching to explain a little bit about what the two bills before us are. We are jumping from pay equity to a very, very different subject, a subject that was introduced in this House precisely a year ago.

We're talking about Bill 32, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, and Bill 34, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act and the Personal Property Security Act in respect of Vehicle Transfer Packages. We're talking about these two bills because they're really related. Bill 34, changes to the vehicle transfer packages act, also requires changes to the Retail Sales Tax Act.

With regard to the changes to the Retail Sales Tax Act, it's the tax on used cars. Some of the people will remember that, especially before Christmas, there was a fair amount of concern and negative reaction out there in the public about this effort by the government to collect taxes from people who are normally at the lower end of the income scale.

The argument by the government was that people are understating the value of a used car when they come to the licence office and therefore are paying less retail sales tax than they really should. The government felt it wanted to be fair and wanted to make sure that everybody pays what they owe the government.

On principle, I guess it's difficult to argue with that. We are all getting government services and we all should pay our fair share; it's difficult to argue with that. However, when it comes to used cars, it's always a very big question: What is the car still worth? In the open market, I guess you can get lucky and get a good price, and sometimes you get a lemon and you pay a high price. It's somewhat difficult to establish what

really is a reasonable price for a used car, and I think that's where the government ran into difficulties at first.

I made several statements in the House. For example, on November 18, 1992, and again on December 9, I took issue with the government with this new, essentially, tax collection measure on the sale of used cars. I said this measure really is especially hard on some of the most vulnerable members of society, those who don't have enough money to buy a new car but who can just afford to buy a used car, and usually a car that's been around for a while.

In fact, I got several letters. One of them—I have this letter right here somewhere—was from Mr Jim McCann in Classic Corners in eastern Ontario. He said: "This is another NDP 'ripoff' of the taxpayers and consumers, especially the poor who can only afford an old car if they are lucky. It should be obvious to anyone that cars, especially old cars, are not equal in value!! Is it not time to scrap these procedures without further delay?"

That was Mr McCann writing to me, and I think he wrote to some of the other members of the House as well. He was by no means the only one who contacted me, and I'm sure all members of the House received phone calls and letters from irate people; people, as I indicated, who are not well off. The letters and calls that I received were mostly from people in rental areas in my riding who were very upset when they went and wanted to register their used car and found out they had to pay retail sales tax on what's called the Red Book. It wasn't the purchase price or the sale price for the used car that was going to be the basis for the retail sales tax, but this Red Book, which is used in the used car industry to establish prices. I guess they usually go for the higher end.

Of course, they don't take into account at all the history of that specific car. The Red Book establishes general criteria as to how much a particular make is still worth in a particular year after so many years, but it doesn't take into account the specific history of that individual car that's being sold. So that's where people were really upset, that they were buying cars that in their opinion, and of course in the opinion of the seller, weren't at all worth any more what the Red Book said. They objected to having to pay the retail sales tax according to the Red Book price and not the actual sale price.

I should say, though, perhaps to the credit of the government, that it listened to some of the criticism, and that is perhaps evidence for the usefulness of not immediately passing legislation. As I just mentioned, this was first introduced last June, and now it's June 1993 and we're still discussing it. But in the meantime, the government did in fact have second thoughts about it. Where they at first said, "If you're dissatisfied with the retail sales tax you paid, and if you really feel that the Red Book price overvalued your car, okay, fine; pay

the tax first, then have your car appraised, and if the appraisal comes in lower than what the Red Book is, then you'll get a rebate from the Ministry of Revenue."

Imagine that, how complicated that's going to be and how long that takes, knowing full well the ministry bureaucracy; how complicated are the wheels of government, how long it sometimes takes to get them moving.

**1650**

The government did in fact say: "Okay, that is too complicated. We will accept that if you go out there and you have your car appraised you can come in with that appraised value to the licence office and we will calculate the retail sales tax on the basis of that appraised value. You don't have to apply for a rebate; you can pay the retail sales tax up front on the appraised value."

The second change the government did make or is going to make to the bill—these are amendments—is that any transaction that is worth less than \$1,000, the government will in fact accept the actual sale price for taxation purposes. As I indicated, prior to this proposed change in the legislation, to this amendment, the person was forced to pay the tax on the Red Book value of the vehicle, regardless of the actual value of the automobile. So if it's sold for less than \$1,000, then the government will accept the sale price as the actual price to calculate the retail sales tax.

I welcome those two changes, frankly. It shows that a bit of a waiting period before legislation is passed can bring some improvements.

However, I take issue with the principle itself. Was there really such a serious problem with the collection of retail sales tax, and who are the people we're really squeezing the money out of? As I indicated, the people who are buying the used cars are usually at the lower end of the income spectrum. Do we really have to make every imaginable effort to get the last tax dollar out of this group?

I'm not that familiar with the used car sales business, but nobody ever made that issue to me or brought that issue to me as a major revenue problem. Apparently, the Minister of Finance or the minister of revenue was thinking that a lot of money was being lost that way.

If this were the only revenue increase that we have seen by this government, I could say: "Okay, fine. Let it go ahead." However, as my leader said today in question period, this is by no means the only fee hike or taxation increase. As we all know—and probably those who don't know will soon realize and find out—as of July 1, there are going to be a tremendous number of fee hikes and income tax hikes, and this issue of collecting the retail sales tax more aggressively on used cars is just a part of that additional revenue hike and revenue grab that is being put forward by the government.



**Hon Allan Pilkey (Minister without Portfolio in Municipal Affairs):** You should know all about that. You had 35 increases when you were in government.

**Mr Daigeler:** The former minister, the member for Oshawa, is saying we should know about it. "The Liberals should know about tax increases and fee increases." The member for Oshawa should just wait a minute because I'm going to come to that. I'm going to face that argument square on, and I'm not at all afraid to face that argument head on.

But let's just hear, first of all, what fee increases and what revenue hikes the NDP government is putting forward as of July 1.

For example, the cost of registering a snowmobile will increase by 20%. This is just in the area of transportation. Then, the cost of taking a road test will increase by almost 80%. The cost of an off-road vehicle permit will double to \$10 from \$5. The cost of a permit validation sticker for a moped will quadruple. The cost of obtaining a collision report from the Ministry of Transportation will jump 20%, and the Ministry of Transportation alone will expect an increase of about \$42 million in non-tax revenue from all of these higher fees. That's just in the Ministry of Transportation.

There's the Attorney General. The Attorney General, for example, is increasing the provincial victim fine surcharge, which will net the government \$3 million. The Attorney General also expects to raise \$500,000 from the enhanced collection of money gained through the commission of a crime.

Then, of course, the consumer and corporate affairs ministry has also a whole range of fee increases, permit increases. There are more fees for land and water permits, and on and on it goes.

**Hon Mr Pilkey:** How about the Liberal record?

**Mr Daigeler:** But as the member for Oshawa said, how about the Liberal record? I'm quite pleased to speak to that because, yes, it is true. When I was the member for Nepean from 1987 to 1990, when people came and said, "Well, what about these tax increases and fee increases?" I always said, and I was not hesitant to defend that, "If you want the service, you have to pay for it."

Frankly, at that time, times were good. I remember on a daily basis, I received letters and phone calls—and I'm sure the members still do that—and representations and delegations from people who said, "We need," not just "want," "this and that increased service, this and that increased facility."

In my own riding, in my own area of Ottawa-Carleton, there was a daily list of people who came and said: "We want government to provide this, and we want government to provide better educational services. We want government to provide better protection for women against violence. We want a drug treatment

centre for our young adolescents. We want a 911 service in Ottawa-Carleton."

I always said: "Fine, let us work together on this, but let us not put the burden for the payment of these services to future generations. So if we do want these services, if that's what the people out there want, let us pay for it." Therefore, I agreed with Treasurer Bob Nixon that, yes, we had to increase taxes and revenues, and frankly, it was possible in those days.

It was very difficult to say, "No, you cannot have the service," because frankly, every year the revenues were increasing. It's very difficult to say, "Well, if the money's actually coming into the provincial treasury"—how can you say to the people out there who are desperate, for example, on waiting lists for health care—I remember the NDP, even the Tories, who are these days yelling, "Oh, the Liberals spent too much money." They used to come in here, bring all the—not quite half dead but the people who were suffering from illnesses, heart defects and heart problems. They brought them right in here in this Legislature. They used to criticize the member for Oriole, the Minister of Health, and they used to come in and say, "Why are you not providing the services that will help these people to get the proper treatment for their heart problems?" on an almost daily basis. I remember, I think it was in 1988, every question was directed towards that.

1700

Then we brought in measures that helped these people, but of course there's a cost associated with it. When the times are good, I think a reasonable government will take a reasonable position. It will say: "Yes, we do have the revenue. If we really want the service, then let us bring in additional tax revenue through fee increases, if we do not hurt the economy." That's the decision we took, and I'm not ashamed at all to defend this.

However, things have changed since then. You have to be responsive to the economic situation the way it is now. The economic situation is very, very different and now is not the time to take out additional revenues from the people of this province, because that will hurt the economy even further. However—that's where I have a big argument with the Tories—that has to include a reduction in the expectations that we have from government.

The Tories say, "Well, the Liberals expanded government." We didn't expand government, we expanded the services, that I admit, and in order to have the services, you have to have government. It's not the fault of the civil servants that the people want the services. You can't run the services without the civil servants, without the bureaucracy. I think it's a fallacy to say, "Oh, well, there's all kinds of duplication, there's all kinds of fat civil servants." That's not true.

I think, in all fairness to the civil servants, they are

providing the work, they're providing the service that we collectively as a people have asked them to do. We have asked for services. If somebody wants the services, somebody has to provide the services, and you have a bureaucrat. So really, if you want to reduce government, and now I think is the time to reduce government, we also have to be prepared to reduce services.

Frankly, I have no qualms in saying that. I wrote that last year in my paper in Nepean. That's a reality of life that I'm not sure we have fully understood yet. We can't just say, "Cut back government," because this is linguistics. Government is there to provide services. If you say, "Cut back government," you mean, "Cut back services." That, in my opinion, the current government has not fully realized yet either.

In fact they're bringing in some services, as we saw on Friday with the Minister of Health making the announcement she is going to eliminate the private sector in home care providers. I think that's a very foolish initiative that is actually going to make it more expensive to provide the service that the people out there want.

The member for Oshawa said, "What about the Liberal record in terms of raising fees?" Yes, we raised fees, we raised taxes, because the service was required and the people wanted the service and we were able to pay for it. The revenue was there in those days and we were still able to balance the budget.

Today the situation is very different, and that's what the government has to realize. You cannot just come in with an ideology and stay a course that was valid perhaps three or four years ago. You have to adjust your economic policies in the same way you are adjusting your social policies. That's the main point I'm trying to get across to this government. You have to recognize the relationship between your fiscal policy and the economic realities as they are out there.

To come back to the bill before us—I haven't spoken about that yet—Bill 34 establishes a new package for used cars. Frankly, for the life of me, I can't figure out why the government is trying to do this, because really this to me seems like a useless service.

If this were something that the people asked for, perhaps I could understand it, but nobody ever contacted me or phoned me or I certainly haven't heard any of my colleagues requesting the government to provide a used-car vehicle package. You have to register now and you get a nice little certificate, I guess, with each car and you have to write in who owned the car. Frankly, I am just not sure at all what the usefulness of this package is.

Secondly, I think the administration of this package is going to be extremely complicated. I mean, look at the OHIP cards. We're now in this House hearing almost every day how many OHIP cards are issued in

the wrong way and the problems with these cards. I'm sure many of the members know about the birth registrations, if they're all active in their constituency and they have a constituency office.

A lot of my staff's work has to do with looking after birth certificates, because it takes a long time to get the birth certificates. Sometimes people lose them and just send it back in and then the name is spelled wrong, and it goes on and on and it takes a long time. I can just see how complex and complicated and how cumbersome this used-vehicle package is going to be.

Why this government would want to put in place what's really red tape, that I don't understand at all. I understand perhaps that they want to increase some money and they want to have some extra money. Okay, I can understand that. They're so desperate that they need all the revenues from wherever they can get them. But why they'd want to put in this package that will in fact require more administration, probably will require more civil servants as well—I don't know for sure, but probably.

I mean, who is going to do all of this? What happens if you lose the package? I'm sure there are going to be lots of people who say: "Where did I put this package now? Where is it?" They're going to be totally disturbed and frustrated when they can't find the package and then they have to buy a new one, and I understand every time you buy this package it costs \$20—now. I mean, I'm sure the fee is going to rise down the road, because fees never drop, they always increase.

So, to me, I do not understand why this measure is being brought in, other than frankly as a thinly disguised effort to raise new revenues, and to raise new revenues at a time, as I said, which can ill afford these kinds of measures that do not provide truly needed service.

If you could put forward an argument as to why we really need this, "This is really something that the people of Ontario have insisted and they've asked for and we, as a responsive government, okay, we want to respond to it," fine. But I tell you, I haven't had one person make such a request, in fact the opposite. As soon as the government announced this, I got phone calls from people saying: "Why in the world are you coming up with this now? Why are you punishing us even more by trying to squeeze the last dollar out of us in terms of retail sales tax on used cars?"

As I indicated, I do support, if the people are asking for the service, then yes, we, as responsible politicians, have to take a very serious look at whether we can provide the service, but we must be honest about it. There's a cost associated with it, and we cannot hide that cost either. That was the position that I took when we were on the government side and I've always defended that.



However, when we no longer can afford the cost of the service, then we also have to say that, and we have to be up front about it and we have to tell the people that while we would like to provide the service, we can't afford it. That's the reality of life and I think that's the frankness and the honesty the public expects of us. With this particular measure that is in front of us, I cannot see why we even need this service and therefore even less am I prepared to support the cost that's associated with this measure.

1710

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable member for Nepean for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I would like to comment on some of the remarks of the member for Nepean, although I won't really comment on the wonderful job that the Liberal government did that led up to where we are now, and the wonderful start on this province going into debt.

I will say it is a strange situation that just after we have seen the largest budget that this province or probably this country has ever seen, now we're debating two bills and we're debating these two bills together, although the member for Nepean spent most of his time on Bill 34, two bills that arose out of last year's budget, two bills that were introduced on June 1, 1992. It is a very strange procedure, particularly when all of this has been going on and we haven't even voted on these bills.

I will say that I believe this government simply says, "Oh, well, this is a very minor administrative matter; there's really not too much that we need to do; we'll probably have to hire a few more civil servants to administer this bill," but when you start thinking about it, the real bureaucracy of this whole process is on the purchaser and the vendor in private sales, and the problems these people are going to have to go through to simply buy and sell used vehicles.

The question I have for the New Democratic Party, through the member for Nepean, is, who buys used cars? It certainly isn't the rich. It's the working people of this province, the people who can't afford the large, expensive cars that are coming out today. That is the major concern that I think we on this side of the House, and I would hope you on the government side of the House, would have with respect to this bill, that it's directed towards the poor, that it's directed towards the people of this province who can't afford the more expensive vehicles that are being made today. So keep in mind when you're voting on this piece of legislation that that's what you're proposing, a tax on the poor.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** The member for Nepean, I think, does want to support this bill but has shown a little reluctance. He asked for some justifications for the nature of the bill. Let me say that I think there are several reasons for this bill.

First of all, in terms of Bill 32, the question is an issue of fairness in our tax system. There are many people who are paying their full, fair share of sales tax on the sales of used cars; there are many other people who aren't. If we're going to ensure that the people have faith in our system and in our tax system, we need to ensure that people understand that everyone is playing by the same rules and the implementation of Bill 32 helps to ensure and put more faith back into the system to ensure that there's fairness.

With respect to Bill 34 and the vehicle information package, the member again does not see any justification for this package. Let me remind the member that in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, during 1991 and 1992, the consumer complaints—the two main areas happened to deal with vehicle repairs and vehicle purchases of new and used cars. Part of what this vehicle information package will do is that it will protect consumers because they will be able to find out the full information about the history of the vehicle that they are buying.

I think that many working people out there who don't always otherwise have the resources to advocate for themselves or go through a Small Claims Court process, or any of the other processes to seek retribution if they happen to be taken advantage of, will welcome this as a way of ensuring that they can have strong consumer protection and know that what they're paying for in a used vehicle and what they're getting is actually the case. I think consumer protection and fairness in terms of how we have a sales tax system are two very strong reasons for supporting this piece of legislation, and I think over time the people in the province of Ontario will see them as good reasons as well.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I'd like to take a few moments, first to congratulate the member for Nepean on an excellent speech, discussing two very important areas. I am going to be looking very shortly to participating fully in the debate.

I think we have to recognize that the tax which is included in this piece of legislation directs itself to people who purchase used cars. We know, especially during this recession, that this affects an awful lot of people. We know that it will affect an awful lot of young people, students who are purchasing used cars.

I heard the member just recently, from the government side, say it was important to legislate this change in tax to make sure that people paid their fair share. What that member is saying is that some people have not paid. When you ask the government, "What are the statistics? What are the facts upon which you base the assertion that people in this province, on the purchase of used cars, have not been paying their fair share?" it doesn't have an answer. I think it's very important that we recognize that what the government has done is not only bang another tax on people who are less able to

afford it, but also to indicate that they have not been paying their fair share. I think that is to be very critical, and rightly so, of the government.

The last point I want to make is that the general public was not aware of this new tax. There was no statement. There was no mention of this tax. People found out about this tax when they went to a licensing bureau. That to me is consistent with this government only being able to act in a state of chaos.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Addressing this particular issue is of interest to me, because whatever government introduced it, and I understand that it's in place, this government is in fact broadening the brush or broadening the parameters of this tax.

I don't understand why a used car should be subject to tax, period. It seems to me that a car that is taxed as a new car should pay a provincial sales tax and the GST. Once that car's been sold once, the money's been recouped by the government. They've had their fair share. You've gotten your revenues from the sale of that car. Subsequently, that car could be sold three or four or five or six times in its life. Every time, the government jumps in and hits every purchaser additionally for that car, when originally the tax was paid.

The defenders are standing over there saying, "We've got to introduce this because it's fair for everybody, because people are ripping off the system." That's where they come at this argument completely from the wrong side. The tax was paid on the new vehicle properly and up front. I ask this government, I ask anyone who is selling a car, why then would they be subject to continual taxation on a car that could produce \$10, \$50, \$1,000 in revenue for the government?

If you're trying to tell me that this is defending the rights of the citizens and defending the rights of people who buy cars, I don't buy that. This is just another process for you to prop up your revenues at the expense of the consumer. You're not creating any extra revenue out there and no extra work, no extra money for the private sector. All you're doing is generating more money for your coffers on something that's already been taxed to death when it rolled off the assembly line. Don't give me that defence. It's a revenue grab. Admit it.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Nepean has up to two minutes for his reply.

1720

**Mr Daigeler:** Let me first of all say welcome back to the member for Oxford, who is back from his honeymoon, I understand. I hope he will read the Hansard in which I congratulated him last week. The House was unanimous in extending our best wishes to you and your bride on your new state of life. So much for the compliments; now back to real life.

The member for Oxford said that with this vehicle

package you will now know about the history of the vehicle. I'm not sure whether it's parliamentary to say that is misleading, and I certainly don't want to imply a deliberate misleading here, but if the public expects the full history of the vehicle, that is simply not correct. It will simply, as far as I know, give the registration of the previous owners. In terms of the history, whether that car was used as a taxi or whatever, there's no general history of that vehicle mentioned in that package at all. If anybody out there thinks this new package is going to tell them precisely what the technical history is of that car, he or she is sadly mistaken. It's simply who the previous owners were.

With regard to the member for Etobicoke West, I guess the member here is in a conflict of interest, because I understand that he stands in the best Frank Miller tradition where he's trying to sell cars to even members of the Legislature, so perhaps he has an interest in terms of the tax revenue that is being brought in every time a car is sold. Frankly, on principle I guess he's got an argument, but as I said before, as Liberals we are pragmatic—

**Mr Stockwell:** Mr Speaker, on a point of privilege: I would caution the member for Nepean. This is a general application to a general tax bill. Any specific gain to me personally, calling for a conflict, is thoroughly and totally out of line and inappropriate for this Legislature.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** Oh, brother. After all the things you've said about people, I can't believe you're getting up on this point.

**Mr Stockwell:** The ex-member for Perth is now questioning my motives again.

**Mrs Haslam:** I am not the ex-member. Point of order, Mr Speaker. Want to play point of privilege? I am not an ex-member.

**The Speaker:** I realize that the member for Perth is still alive and well and is in fact in the chamber. Perhaps the member for Etobicoke West could complete his point of privilege quickly.

**Mr Stockwell:** I withdraw. She's not the ex-member. She's the ex-minister from Perth. I apologize.

All I'm suggesting is that, by general application, this is a tax bill throughout the province. There's no pecuniary interest to me specifically on whether this carries or doesn't carry, and I suggest that the conflict statement is unfair and should be withdrawn.

**The Speaker:** I understand the member's point of privilege. He in fact does not have one, but the member for Nepean may wish to add something to the record.

**Mr Daigeler:** I certainly wasn't in any way, shape or form trying to imply that the member was having a pecuniary interest in this matter. I simply thought it was of great interest that we had previous Conservative members who were very much involved in the car



industry, in particular Frank Miller. In that regard, I think the member is in an honourable tradition and I wish him well in his efforts.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** The obvious conclusion that anybody reading this bill would come to is that this is a significant tax grab. It goes in the same category as such tax grabs as the registration fee which companies were forced to pay for reregistration of their companies.

Let's just look at that one for the moment. Last year the government sent out to all companies that had valid registrations of their companies within this province a form with very ill-defined threats as to what would happen if they were not filled in and returned with \$50 per company. That \$50 is a significant burden for people who may have two, three, four, five or six companies. I know the NDP will say, "Well, they're fat capitalists," but there are many reasons that companies have to order their affairs as separate companies. Sometimes there might be slightly different shareholdings, and some of those companies might be currently inactive. Obviously, the objective should be—

**Interjection:** Talk quietly.

**Mr Turnbull:** Yes, I do notice. I certainly should speak quietly because we don't want to wake up Mrs Mathysen from her slumbers.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You know as well as I know, as well as he knows, that you can't refer to members in this place by their name. He should withdraw that and he should apologize and shouldn't be permitted to do it. You know that, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The member for Downsview has a point of order. We refer to members by the name of their constituency.

**Mr Turnbull:** Indeed, Mr Speaker. I would certainly, in the tradition of this House, like to say "wake up the member for Middlesex from her sleep." I'm pleased my friend across the floor pointed that out.

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I happen to have the flu. I am doing my duty and I resent the underhanded way—

**Mr Turnbull:** In the tax grab they made with the registration of companies last year, I've had so many people contacting me and telling me about the significant burden that puts on their companies. Surely, we're in a situation where we should have a government that is encouraging entrepreneurial effort today, not trying to kill it. That was a tax grab last year which has already gone through.

Here we have another measure from last year's budget; not this year's budget but last year's budget. It demonstrates very well how incapable this government is of ordering its own affairs. On the budget we have

just had, we've had two rounds of rotation of debate on it, so my party has had two people up speaking on this year's budget.

The fact is, there are only two fixed items which are considered to be confidence votes in this Legislature. One of them is the throne speech, the other is the budget speech. All other motions of non-confidence are at the option of the government, I regret to say.

So we have a situation where we have had not sufficient debate of the budget and we've certainly not had a vote on the budget. I would suggest, Mr Speaker, and I would ask you, as a matter for you to consider, whether my rights as a member have been violated due to the fact that I haven't had an opportunity to vote legitimately on an aspect which is considered a matter of non-confidence in the government.

We're dealing with this item from last year's fiscal matters which is also a significant tax grab. We have at the present moment a system in this province of voluntary registration of automobiles, so the system being proposed is in fact in existence and there is nothing which stops the purchaser of a vehicle from obliging a vendor to provide documentation. But what the government is doing is saying: "No, a voluntary system is not sufficient. We insist on making it mandatory and gathering this fee."

I think we're getting into a very difficult situation when the government recognizes that the protection of people it claims to be putting forward in this bill is adequate yet it is forcing mandatory legislation. Why? Quite simply, because they have such a hole in their budget. Their deficit alone is significantly in excess of \$10 billion this year. How do I arrive at that? We have \$9 billion-plus which is admitted in the budget, and then if you read the little asterisks, you find they've hidden \$805 million that they've taken off book into the capital corporations, which is still debt this government owes; in addition to that, the \$600 million they're going to oblige school boards to borrow and that the government will then give them the money to repay, mainly because the government is running out of its ability to borrow money so they're moving this off to the school boards.

This tax grab is in the best traditions of the Liberal government that went before it, where anything that moves will be taxed until it moves no longer. Anyone who would suggest that the debates in this House are edifying on this matter for anybody who may watch would be absolutely misguided, because the fact is that we get members from all sides getting up and talking about the problems with the previous government. It goes in rotation and each government does this.

Surely we have to get to the point where we talk about balancing our budget, moving forward and not burdening the future generations. The way to do that is not by these penny ante grabs at tax, and this is a tax.

It will be called a fee, but nevertheless we know this is in fact a tax, just like the tax which went along with the reregistration of companies that I spoke about before, and I may say that the re-registration of companies was absolutely unnecessary because all of the information the government was requiring was already in the files of the government. So why were they going out? They wanted the tax. They wanted money.

1730

I see my friend across the floor laughing his head off. Tell me this isn't true. We have such a sense of how humorous this is when we talk about tax grabs. "Oh, tell me it isn't so." We know the tax grabs that we've seen this year of \$2 billion are going to further depress the economy, which will make people be more inclined to buy second-hand cars. The fact is—

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** What about the big tax grab the Tories brought in before when they got into office?

**Mr Turnbull:** I hear across the floor the member for Cochrane North saying, "What about the tax grab the Tories brought in?" It's interesting that last year the federal Tories reduced the tax burden and this same government not only offset that tax decrease in the tax base but they overshot it.

I see we've got them a little bit stirred up. But read the information. Find out if that is not true. It's amazing that we have members here who refuse the facts, refuse to acknowledge that the Tories federally reduced the income tax levels last year and this government increased them.

Let's turn to this particular package. We are supposed to be protecting the consumers in this. The existence of this package as a voluntary program shows that we have this protection, but perhaps we haven't got sufficient protection, because the interesting thing is that this package the government is bringing in is severely flawed.

Let us talk about the US experience. In the US they have a system of title, a title document which goes along with each vehicle. That title document is lodged with the owner of any debts which are owed, so that if somebody goes to the bank and borrows money to finance a vehicle, the title document will be lodged with the bank until such time as the debt is paid off. If somebody is leasing an automobile, the leasing company keeps on holding the title document.

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** Which state?

**Mr Turnbull:** I hear across the floor a question, "Which state?" Frankly, across the whole of the United States. It exists in the whole of the United States. No vehicle can be sold in the US unless that title document is made available to the buyer. What has happened here is this title document in the US is stamped with a large stamp to indicate that the vehicle has been totalled, if

there has been a major accident. So anybody who is rebuilding a vehicle based upon the scrap cannot get away with selling it in the US to an unsuspecting buyer unless they admit that the vehicle has been severely damaged. But what has been created here is a market of rebuilt US wrecks that are brought into Canada and those wrecked vehicles are sold here because we don't have a title document which indicates that it has been wrecked.

So where is the consumer protection? Quite frankly, this government isn't particularly interested in consumer protection. What they are interested in is the tax grab.

I think if we were to seriously want to move forward with title protection, you would find that my party would probably be fairly supportive of this government, but instead it hasn't done this. There are, however, some people who are quite pleased with this legislation. The licence issuers who have been so badly affected by this government will at least get a little extra business out of it, so there is some light at the end of the tunnel.

Also, I have been told by new automobile dealers that they feel that this legislation will be quite good for them. The reason for that is because they believe that they will, in essence, corner the market on resale of vehicles because it will become so cumbersome for private vendors that they will be disinclined to go through all of this rigmarole and pay taxes, pay the fee, when these very same people have paid significant taxes buying the car new. Here we've got the situation that they've paid massive taxes on purchasing the car, a car which hopefully has been manufactured in Canada—particularly hopefully it's been manufactured in Ontario—but what we want to do is we want to—

**Mr Huget:** What kind of car do you drive?

**Mr Turnbull:** There's a question from across the floor: What car do I drive? I drive a car which is made in Nova Scotia, sir.

These cars have had heavy taxes paid on them, and—

**Mr Perruzza:** You don't like Ontario-made cars?

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Turnbull:** —having paid these taxes, the purchaser of that car is going to be gouged again for another fee.

What about the purchaser of this vehicle having to pay? Let's look at the people who are in fact buying these older cars. They are typically the working poor, the very people we've always heard this government saying they wanted to protect. Well, we dispelled that myth a long time ago, because this is a government that isn't interested in maintaining jobs in this province. They've brought in such bills as Bill 40, which has driven jobs out of the province, and they have brought in constant attacks on the private system.

All we have to look at is the example last Friday of the attack on the private health care providers. That's a



very interesting story. Nobody has ever suggested that the non-profit health care providers were disallowed from competing in this province, but this government says: "Oh, well, that's nasty. The taxpayers are paying a profit to somebody. Isn't that awful? Isn't that just dreadful?"

Whoever said that those organizations that are non-profit, which presumably, according to the government's credo, can provide services for less money because they don't have to make a profit—whoever saw them competing and taking jobs away from the private sector? Not too many people, because the fact is, the private sector works a lot better than the non-profit sector, by and large, with some significant examples of very good non-profit organizations. I'm very proud to support a lot of these good non-profit organizations.

But this government is making an attack directly on the for-profit sector because they hate anybody who is successful, anybody who can make money and create jobs in this province. That ultimately is going to be the saviour of this province and it's going to be the saviour of this country. If we want to enjoy a standard of living at the level that we had when the Tories were around, you are simply going to have to encourage the private sector.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Turnbull:** Now, the amazing thing is, for the people who are watching this program and can't hear all of the catcalls, the groans and moans about the standard of living when the Tories were in power, but I would ask everybody to go back and think back to the standard of living that we had, and there's no doubt about it, you enjoyed a much better standard of living than anybody's enjoying under your administration. You are grinding this province into the ground.

The fact is that all of the other provinces of Canada are looking at Ontario with disbelief as to how you are driving the private sector out, and with it, you're practically having to switch off the lights in this province. We will never, ever be able to get rid of this debt that you have run up in many, many years. It's going to mean that several governments are going to struggle through all kinds of measures, but those measures will all be titled "Bill to Fix the Mess that the NDP Made in This Province." Have no doubts about that.

1740

The constituents of York Mills tell me constantly, "Why on earth don't you get rid of these people?" I have told them that there are only two confidence votes, and those are the throne speech and the budget speech. The government isn't even prepared to bring the budget speech for further debate and vote, because I would like to see how your pals in the unions will think about your voting for these tax grabs and the legislation you're bringing against your own workers.

Consumers are hurt by this government and they're further hurt by all of the legislation this government brings in. We have a government which is tax-hungry. The reason for that is because in their own mind they believe they have a revenue problem. We don't have a revenue problem. Last year we had the second-highest revenues in history. Let's just think about that: The second-highest revenues that this province has ever had in history were last year's take by the provincial government. But we have a massively growing deficit, and the reason for that is the spending by this government.

The knee-jerk reaction is to say, "But we've got all of these unemployed and we've had to increase welfare." The increase in welfare is not the reason this government has the problems. It's the spending on other programs such as non-profit housing, which the Provincial Auditor has criticized. This government absolutely stands up and defends and refuses to accept that it has any problems. That is the reason there is a spending problem. You cannot balance a budget when you have a government out of control, drunk with its expenditures. They refuse to come to the basic question of, why not control health card fraud?

**Interjection:** Oh, yes.

**Mr Turnbull:** There's a groan across the floor, "Oh, yes." How do you have health card fraud? You have people who are claiming to have two hysterectomies on their card. The amazing thing with this tax grab bill is that the working poor who are buying an old car are having to pay for the fact that this government—and the previous government—does not insist that when the seniors get their health card, they have to remit the old health card they have.

There's a physician who told me that it's possible, once a senior gets a health card, that the old health card can be trotted off down to Buffalo and sold for \$3,000.

**Interjection:** How much?

**Mr Turnbull:** For \$3,000 per card. That's where you're losing the revenue and that is where it's costing this province millions and millions and millions. If you were to control those problems—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Turnbull:** I see you don't like the truth. You don't like the fact that there's health card fraud that you are not prepared to address. If you would control that, you wouldn't have to gouge the working poor with this tax grab to transfer vehicles. Anybody who needs the protection of knowing whether there's any liens on the vehicle could simply insist that the vendor provide that documentation.

It would seem reasonable that the purchaser should bear the cost of that transfer simply because the person who bought the car originally, when it was new, has already spent the taxes. That's the bottom line. We've already paid taxes. We pay rather high taxes on cars in

this country, and this government wants to encourage people flipping the car over time and again. Why? Because they get tax revenue every single time it is sold. It's not right.

With that, I will say that I will not be voting with the government on this legislation. I would suggest that the very best thing they could do would be to get their house in order. First of all, we should be debating this year's budget, not budget measures from last year, because they're so incompetent they cannot order their affairs. We should have a vote on the budget, which is a confidence vote. Then I would hope that we would move to a general election and then we would see what the people of this province think about all of these tax measures you're involved with.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for York Mills for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Perruzza:** I sat here and I listened closely to some of the things that the member for York Mills had to say. I can't help but think how he gives the big-C "Conservative" word a whole new meaning. I could go into a broad definition, but I guess there's only one word that comes to mind, and that's "absurd," because a lot of the things he had to say were just simply absurd.

He talked about tax grabs, and then when he referred to the Conservative federal government's taxing program, he applauded them, and he said last year they gave everybody a tax break. Well, the year before, they introduced the GST. How much does that net? I don't know, \$28 billion or \$30 billion, \$34 billion, \$35 billion? Nobody really quite knows because they've never really come clean on exactly how much money that tax generates.

But in the midst of all that, in the midst of introducing the GST, in the midst of generating additional revenues of, let's say, \$30 billion across the board, they gave Canadians a tax break. Well, I'll also say to the member that they cut UI fees, they reallocated the baby bonus, along with a number of other things, and then he has the nerve to stand in his place and say Conservatives deal diligently and responsibly with these kinds of matters.

I say to him that he had better take a very close, long, hard look at what the Mulroney government and what Conservative governments have done in this country. They've raised the debt, they've raised the deficit and they've raised taxes to unprecedented levels. But the saddest thing of all is what they've done to unemployment and the way they've increased unemployment across this country.

**The Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Mr Perruzza:** You should be ashamed of that, sir.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I listened

with great attention to the member's speech, and there were some areas he covered better than other areas. Certainly, if any one of us will recall carefully the telephone calls that were coming to our constituency offices, one of the things that people were calling about had to be this particular change in legislation, which is very bothersome to people.

It's extremely bureaucratic. It tends to penalize students, who have to buy lower-cost cars, and people who don't have high incomes. It has caused a good deal of problems for people who fix up old cars and try to get them back into good condition and put them back on the road and people who do it for a hobby. This has been an initiative, quite obviously a tax grab, designed to prevent what the government perceived to be people who are evading the appropriate tax, and it just means that more and more people may be without transportation in the province.

But there are some things the member didn't mention, and I heard a response come up about the federal government and so on. It's always interesting to see that the Premier is available at all times when there's an opportunity to talk about something that has nothing to do with the province of Ontario but is a chance to take a shot at somebody else.

I know the member probably made reference to this in his speech today, but there he is, large as life, condemning the senators for being into the trough, and everybody agrees with that, but what's that got to do with Bob Rae and Queen's Park? Then, of course, he's condemning the federal government for the makeup of the cabinet, when, if you look at what the Prime Minister has to work with over there, you'll know why we have a cabinet of the kind that we have federally.

So it's two chances for the Premier. There are the news media lined up to scrum. You don't see him running away from the scrum in this case. He's large as life when it has something to do with somebody else and not to do with his own record in this province.

1750

**Mr Tilson:** I'd like to congratulate the member for York Mills on the thoughts and contributions he has made with this particular bill. I can understand the rationale as to why this government introduced and is proceeding with this bill.

The first, of course, is that there were too many used-car buyers who did cheat on the tax collector. They filed misleading receipts and they were paying less tax than they should have. I believe that's been going on. The second, of course, is that there were some used-car dealers who were selling their motor vehicles privately. These of course were the curbsiders, which is why this legislation is called the curbsider legislation, and these people were conspiring with buyers to avoid the sales tax so that a motor vehicle could be sold more cheaply off the lot than on. So I understand why the legislation,



the principles behind it.

But on the other hand, there doesn't seem to be any relief to the poor, to the middle-income bracket, the people who are buying these motor vehicles. There are many of you in this House who represent people in auto constituencies, and yet where is the relief to those people, who are having grave concerns?

The other issue is, are taxes ever going to go down, let alone be helped? Is a government such as yours continually going to be finding ways such as this to wedge the knife in a little harder to the poor and to the middle-income individuals?

I would say that with this particular legislation, as has been pointed out by the member for York Mills, they are not.

The member for York Mills commented on some procedures that are being followed in the American jurisdictions and I think that's a process that should be looked at by this government and hopefully will be before this legislation is passed.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I'd like to partake in this two-minute exercise by indicating that there are some real problems to the legislation that the government has introduced, apart from the very obvious problem which they just do not seem to recognize, that being that it affects those who can least afford it. There's no question that when one deals with an increased taxation, as this bill does, on used cars, it will have no other impact than to hurt those who primarily purchase used cars, and that will be people such as students, people who may be out of work, people who can't afford new cars. This legislation and the way it has been worded does and has no other effect than hurt those people by increasing the tax that those people will pay on used cars.

Now, the other point that I make is that the government was just so faulty in how it conveyed this new tax to the general public. I say "faulty" in that they didn't inform the general public that they were changing the tax structure when people purchase used cars. I know that in my area, Mississauga North, and I have a file of many letters, people were not informed of the change in taxes until they went to their local licensing office. I think that apart from their criticism and concern about the increased taxation itself, there is another criticism, and that is that the government just doesn't know how to inform the general public as to what its policies will be, and that has hurt a great many people, not only in my riding but across this province.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for York Mills has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Turnbull:** Starting with the member for Downsview: He talks about the changes in the tax structure that the federal government brought in last year. I would invite him, any time that he wants to

debate this in detail with me, to come to my office, and I will show him in detail the numbers as to where the federal government reduced the personal income tax last year for all Canadians and where this government immediately moved to mop up that decrease and in fact overshot. So the increase in taxes that this government brought in last year was greater than the reduction that the federal government made.

I would also point out to him that for the poor people who are trying to get a home for the first time, the cost of increasing the tax, of putting tax on sand and gravel, has been estimated by the Toronto Home Builders' Association as \$500 per house as a minimum. That is what this government is doing to undermine the economy of this province and also the poor people who are trying to get a start, and particularly the people who are wanting to get their first house.

I was particularly struck by the validity of my friend the member for St Catharines speaking about that this Premier we have of this province who's unwilling to attend a conference to discuss the pressing matters of the G-7 but is willing to go out at any opportunity and dump on the federal government. Instead of working with it to solving the fiscal problems we have in this province, all they can think about is trying to move the blame to somebody else. When will this government finally come to terms with the blame that it deserves? They will never accept the fact that they can ever be guilty of anything. I would suggest to them very simply to look in the mirror, read their speeches and understand the legislation that their government is bringing down.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate? I recognize the honourable member for Mississauga North.

**Mr Offer:** I'm pleased to join in the debate on these particular pieces of legislation.

I want to indicate at the outset that I've been involved in this legislation almost from the day it was introduced. My involvement was as a result of constituent concerns, reaction to the legislation, and this came to me through people in my riding.

I remember the day very well. In my riding of Mississauga North there are a number of licensing offices, but there is one in Streetsville, the Streetsville licensing office. An individual had gone to that licensing office after having purchased a vehicle and was told that in order to complete the transfer of ownership, he would have to pay X amount of dollars in tax.

I happened to have been at the office at that time, as coincidence would have it, and I remember the individual saying, how can he be expected to pay tax on a vehicle that was actually more than what he had paid for the vehicle itself? I asked him some questions about that, as well as the people in the office, and they had indicated that as a result of a new change in government policy, there had been a change in the taxation structure

on the purchase of a new car. This individual was unaware of the change in taxation, I must say I was unaware of the change, and I brought this forward in terms of some newsletters to my constituents and they responded to me.

Having said that as a preamble to my discussion, the area they were primarily concerned with was in Bill 32, section 5, and that section provides, and I read from the explanatory notes of the bill: "that a tax on the transfer of a used motor vehicle is based on the higher of its purchase price or the average wholesale price as determined by the minister. The tax is payable to the vehicle licence issuer at the time that the ownership is transferred."

Mr Speaker, I see that you are looking at me and that time has expired in terms of it, and I would ask for adjournment of the debate at this time.

**The Speaker:** It's not necessary to move adjournment. The clock will stop and indeed we will have an opportunity to hear your remarks when next this legislation comes before the House.

Before adjourning, does the chief government whip have the business statement?

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Fred Wilson (Chief Government Whip):** Mr Speaker, yes: committee of the whole on Bill 48, the Social Contract Act.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** It now being past six of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 1800.

#### ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
35B	Contents	1	8	Mr Elston ..... 1695, 1727, 1736, 1743
35B	Contents	1	9	Mr Arnott ..... 1696
35B	Contents	1	18	Mr Pouliot ..... 1711, 1743
35B	Contents	1	19	Mr Murphy ..... 1711



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LL.D**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Algoma	<b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>	ND	Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A.	L	
Beaches-Woodbine	<b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon Frances</b>	ND	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Brampton North/-Nord	McClelland, Carman	L	
Brampton South/-Sud	Callahan, Robert V.	L	
Brant-Haldimand	Eddy, Ron	L	
Brantford	<b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances
Bruce	Elston, Murray J.	L	
Burlington South/-Sud	Jackson, Cameron	PC	
Cambridge	<b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Carleton	Sterling, Norman W.	PC	
Carleton East/-Est	Morin, Gilles E.	L	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Chatham-Kent	Hope, Randy R.	ND	
Cochrane North/-Nord	Wood, Len	ND	
Cochrane South/-Sud	Bisson, Gilles	ND	
Cornwall	Cleary, John C.	L	
Don Mills	Johnson, David	PC	
Dovercourt	<b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>	ND	Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Downsview	Perruzza, Anthony	ND	
Dufferin-Peel	Tilson, David	PC	
Durham Centre/-Centre	White, Drummond	ND	
Durham East/-Est	Mills, Gord	ND	
Durham West/-Ouest	Wiseman, Jim	ND	
Durham-York	O'Connor, Larry	ND	
Eglinton	Poole, Dianne	L	
Elgin	North, Peter	ND	
Essex-Kent	Hayes, Pat	ND	
Essex South/-Sud	Vacant	L	
Etobicoke-Humber	Henderson, D. James	L	
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	<b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth A.</b>	ND	Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Etobicoke-Rexdale	<b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>	ND	Minister of Municipal Affairs / ministre des Affaires municipales
Etobicoke West/-Ouest	Stockwell, Chris	PC	
Fort William	McLeod, Lyn	L	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
Fort York	Marchese, Rosario	ND	
Frontenac-Addington	<b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio / ministre sans portefeuille
Grey	Murdoch, Bill	PC	
Guelph	Fletcher, Derek	ND	
Haltont Centre/-Centre	Sullivan, Barbara	L	
Haltont North/-Nord	Duignan, Noel	ND	
Hamilton Centre/-Centre	<b>Christopherson, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Hamilton East/-Est	<b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	ND	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Hamilton Mountain	<b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon Brian</b>	ND	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement et ministre délégué à l'Assurance-automobile
Hamilton West/-Ouest	<b>Allen, Hon/L'hon Richard</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce

Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Hastings-Peterborough	<b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon Elmer</b>	ND	Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
High Park-Swansea	<b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>	ND	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales
Huron	Klopp, Paul	ND	
Kenora	Miclash, Frank	L	
Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	Wilson, Gary	ND	
Kitchener	Ferguson, Will	Ind	
Kitchener-Wilmot	Cooper, Mike	ND	
Lake Nipigon/Lac-Nipigon	<b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b>	ND	Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Lambton	MacKinnon, Ellen	ND	
Lanark-Renfrew	Jordan, W. Leo	PC	
Lawrence	Cordiano, Joseph	L	
Leeds-Grenville	Runciman, Robert W.	PC	
Lincoln	Hansen, Ron	ND	
London Centre/-Centre	<b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon Marion</b>	ND	Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues / procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
London North/-Nord	Cunningham, Dianne	PC	
London South/-Sud	Winniger, David	ND	
Markham	Cousens, W. Donald	PC	
Middlesex	Mathysen, Irene	ND	
Mississauga East/-Est	Sola, John	Ind	
Mississauga North/-Nord	Offer, Steven	L	
Mississauga South/-Sud	Marland, Margaret	PC	
Mississauga West/-Ouest	Mahoney, Steven W.	L	
Muskoka-Georgian Bay	Waters, Daniel	ND	
Nepean	Daigeler, Hans	L	
Niagara Falls	Harrington, Margaret H.	ND	
Niagara South/-Sud	<b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation; chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs : whip en chef du gouvernement
Nickel Belt	<b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon Floyd</b>	ND	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Nipissing	Harris, Michael	PC	
Norfolk	Jamison, Norm	ND	
Northumberland	Fawcett, Joan M.	L	
Oakville South/-Sud	Carr, Gary	PC	
Oakwood	Rizzo, Tony	ND	
Oriole	Caplan, Elinor	L	
Oshawa	<b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales
Ottawa Centre/-Centre	<b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b>	ND	Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement
Ottawa East/-Est	Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	L	
Ottawa-Rideau	O'Neill, Yvonne	L	
Ottawa South/-Sud	McGuinty, Dalton J.P.	L	
Ottawa West/-Ouest	Chiarelli, Robert	L	
Oxford	Sutherland, Kimble	ND	
Parkdale	Ruprecht, Tony	L	
Parry Sound	Eves, Ernie	PC	
Perth	Haslam, Karen	ND	
Peterborough	Carter, Jenny	ND	
Port Arthur	<b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé
Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	Poirier, Jean	L	
Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings/Prince Edward- Lennox-Hastings-Sud	Johnson, Paul R.	ND	
Quinte	O'Neil, Hugh P.	L	
Rainy River	<b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b>	ND	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Renfrew North/-Nord	Conway, Sean G.	L	



Constituency/Circonscription	Member/Député(e)	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Riverdale	<b>Churley, Hon/L'hon Marilyn</b>	ND	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est	Villeneuve, Noble	PC	
St Andrew-St Patrick	Akande, Zanana	ND	Speaker / Président
St Catharines	Bradley, James J.	L	
St Catharines-Brock	Haeck, Christel	ND	
St George-St David	Murphy, Tim	L	
Sarnia	Huget, Bob	ND	
Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie	Martin, Tony	ND	
Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry	L	
Scarborough Centre/-Centre	Owens, Stephen	ND	
Scarborough East/-Est	Frankford, Robert	ND	
Scarborough-Ellesmere	<b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	
Scarborough North/-Nord	Curling, Alvin	L	Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Scarborough West/-Ouest	<b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b>	ND	
Simcoe Centre/-Centre	Wessenger, Paul	ND	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Simcoe East/-Est	McLean, Allan K.	PC	
Simcoe West/-Ouest	Wilson, Jim	PC	
Sudbury	Murdock, Sharon	ND	
Sudbury East/-Est	<b>Martel, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	ND	
Timiskaming	Ramsay, David	L	
Victoria-Haliburton	Drainville, Dennis	Ind	
Waterloo North/-Nord	Witmer, Elizabeth	PC	
Welland-Thorold	Kormos, Peter	ND	
Wellington	Arnott, Ted	PC	
Wentworth East/-Est	Morrow, Mark	ND	Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien de formation et d'adaptation de la main- d'oeuvre
Wentworth North/-Nord	Abel, Donald	ND	
Willowdale	Harnick, Charles	PC	
Wilson Heights	Kwinter, Monte	L	
Windsor-Riverside	<b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon David</b>	ND	
Windsor-Sandwich	Dadamo, George	ND	
Windsor-Walkerville	Lessard, Wayne	ND	
York Centre/-Centre	Sorbara, Gregory S.	L	
York East/-Est	Malkowski, Gary	ND	
York Mills	Turnbull, David	PC	
York North/-Nord	Beer, Charles	L	Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales
York South/-Sud	<b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	ND	
Yorkview	Mammoliti, George	ND	

# CONTENTS

Monday 28 June 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Community sports programs</b>	
Mr McGuinty	2031
<b>Education financing</b>	
Mr Runciman	2031
<b>Child witness program</b>	
Mr Winninger	2031
<b>Multiculturalism</b>	
Mrs Caplan	2032
<b>Canada Day</b>	
Mr David Johnson	2032
<b>Bill Berg</b>	
Mr Hansen	2032
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mr Daigeler	2032
<b>Ontario economy</b>	
Mr Turnbull	2033
<b>Youth employment</b>	
Mr Perruzza	2033

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2034
Mrs Grier	2034, 2039
Mr Mahoney	2039
<b>Tax increases</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2035
Mr Laughren	2036
<b>First ministers' meeting</b>	
Mr Carr	2037
Mr Rae	2037
<b>Victims of crime</b>	
Mr Jackson	2038
Mrs Boyd	2038, 2943
Ms Harrington	2042
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Witmer	2040
Mr Laughren	2040
<b>Conservation authorities</b>	
Mr Duignan	2040
Mr Hampton	2041
<b>Race relations</b>	
Mr Curling	2041
Mrs Boyd	2041, 2042
Mr Murphy	2042

## Education financing

Mr Turnbull	2042
Mr Cooke	2042

## Gambling

Mr Bradley	2043
Ms Churley	2043

## Waste management

Mr David Johnson	2044
Mr Wildman	2045

## MOTIONS

### Consideration of bills

Mr Charlton	2045
-------------	------

### Private members' public business

Mr Charlton	2045
-------------	------

## PETITIONS

### Gambling

Mr Elston	2045
Mr O'Connor	2045
Mrs Fawcett	2046
Mr Drainville	2047

### Native hunting and fishing

Mr McLean	2045
-----------	------

### Special education

Mr Beer	2046
Mrs Fawcett	2048

### Court reporters

Mr Harnick	2046
------------	------

### Health care

Mr Hope	2046
---------	------

### GO bus service

Mr Tilson	2046
-----------	------

### Automobile insurance

Mr Gary Wilson	2047
Mr Harnick	2047
Mr O'Connor	2048

### Bicycling safety

Mr McGuinty	2047
-------------	------

### Human rights

Mr O'Connor	2047
-------------	------

### Closure of agricultural college

Mr Elston	2048
-----------	------

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### Standing committee on government agencies

Mrs Marland	2049
-------------	------

## THIRD READINGS

### Pay Equity Amendment Act, 1993,

Bill 102	
Mrs Caplan	2049, 2055
Mr Tilson	2053, 2055, 2060
Mr Perruzza	2054
Ms Poole	2054
Ms Murdock	2054, 2061
Mr Arnott	2059
Ms Poole	2060
Mr Fletcher	2060

## SECOND READINGS

### Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 32

### Vehicle Transfer Package Statute

<b>Law Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 34</b>	
Mr Daigeler	2061, 2066
Mr Tilson	2065, 2070
Mr Sutherland	2065
Mr Offer	2065, 2071
Mr Stockwell	2066
Mr Turnbull	2067, 2071
Mr Perruzza	2070
Mr Bradley	2070

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Ministerial statements

Mr Sterling	2033
Mr Charlton	2033
The Speaker	2034

### Child witness program

Mr Sterling	2034
Mr Murphy	2034

### Business of the House

Mr Fred Wilson	2072
----------------	------

### Errata

	2072
--	------





**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 29 June 1993**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Mardi 29 juin 1993**

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Tuesday 29 June 1993

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### CLOSING OF CAMPGROUNDS

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** It was with much fanfare that the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation announced a new tourism strategy last week. She said the focus of the announcement was to recognize the role that the \$16.9-billion industry plays in the provincial economy and build alliances and coordinate activities of tourism partners.

While this sounds like a very interesting gesture, in my riding we are getting a very different message from the minister. Specifically, the Tourism ministry announced a while back that it was closing five campgrounds in eastern Ontario. Just this summer, it was revealed that two more parks would cease operation.

While this news has had a devastating effect, I was vastly relieved when the former minister said it was his business to keep parks open and that he was willing to consider outside proposals to maintain the parks. In fact, the minister stated in March 1991, supported by the current parliamentary assistant: "We are trying to open the parks. We are doing everything we can to look at available options, and hopefully we will have something in the near future."

With this type of supposed ministry support, combined with an ongoing and significant interest on the part of the private sector, it would seem that opening the parks should be a done deal. Nevertheless, some of the parks remain closed, and I have heard many people say that the fault lies at the feet of the ministry.

If the minister were truly interested in a viable tourism sector in eastern Ontario, she would ensure realistic negotiation for the potential investors, rather than continue to obstruct tourism in eastern Ontario.

##### WATER SUPPLY

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** The council of the county of Grey has asked me to arrange a meeting for it with both the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Environment and Energy to discuss its concerns with water taking. They wish to consider necessary changes to the Planning Act which would provide local municipalities with appropriate controls over licensees' operations.

Water taking from wells for commercial purposes has been going on for some time in Grey, but now that bottled water has become a major industry, we wish to ensure that there will always be an adequate supply of clean water for the residents of our area.

While we have not seen any detrimental effects thus

far, it may be that zoning laws will be required in the future to ensure public input and local acceptance before permits are issued. It may also be that permits should be given for a limited time frame only and that inspections and assessments be done before a renewal is issued.

Clean, clear water plays a significant role in maintaining aquatic life and associated ecosystems. We wish to ensure that this vital resource is protected for the wellbeing of our children.

To this end, I would request that both ministers find the time in their busy schedules to look into this situation, to assess the needs of both the people of Grey and the local commercial ventures and to effect a reasonable broad water policy which will enable business to function and which will ensure the continuance of an abundance of water for the generations to come.

##### ST JOHN AMBULANCE

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** It gives me great pleasure today to rise and mark the 30th anniversary of the St John Ambulance in Whitby.

The St John Ambulance has been an active member of the Whitby community, not only in times of crisis but also at fairs, sports events and public gatherings. The presence of their ambulance and personnel is very comforting and ensures that highly professional, competent care is readily available should the need arise.

Of their current voluntary membership of 123, 119 members are trained to assist with casualty care in crises. St John Ambulance works tirelessly with service groups and youth groups, such as scouts and guides, as well as the general public, to teach and to certify first aid. It's estimated that one out of every 13 Whitby residents has been trained by St John.

The St John Ambulance service is also a good corporate citizen. They participate in civic events and are even cooperative education employers.

St John Ambulance has been unaffected by the latest recession. They rely on donations for their operations, and donations have been forthcoming even though these are very difficult times. I am pleased to say that in these rough times they have survived and are looking forward to the challenges of the future.

I thank them for choosing to stay in Whitby and congratulate them on their 30 successful years.

##### DISTRICT OFFICE RELOCATION

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** Last Friday I met with Rick Blakey, president of Local 335, and Peter Dashfield, the OPSEU staff rep. They are most concerned with the Ministry of Transportation's decision to cut services from an area that is responsible for 275 kilometres of freeway and a population of 261,000 and move it to an area that has no freeway and

a population of 62,000.

They want to know what will be done at 3 am in the winter when a plow breaks down, now that you have shut down the Port Hope garage. The Port Hope office used reclaimed sand for the roads; both Bancroft and Kingston use salt. Will these offices now use cost-effective and environmentally friendly sand? Why was the savings, offered by employees, of \$500,000 in winter works projects ignored?

How much will it cost to move employees when you consider they get the cost of a home and moving expenses? What will you tell Dave Strong, who has worked with your ministry for 33 years only to be handed separation papers with no notice last week? How can you properly redeploy all these people when the counsellors you sent only had a two-day crash course and can't even answer employees' questions?

The sign shop at the Port Hope district office is considered the most cost-effective in production and erection in the province. Now they're being put out of business and work they do is on hold till who knows when. Today my office was contacted urging me to have the Big Apple Drive signs done. They have been told production has been stopped due to your cuts.

How can you justify these cuts? What feasibility study was done? What impact and cost analysis was done? Can you produce documents to verify this measure? If not, as I suspect, will you put your decision on hold?

1340

#### TAX INCREASES

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** Birthdays have always been a time of happy celebration and gift giving, but in Bob Rae's Ontario this tradition is being reversed.

On July 1, Canada's birthday, NDP Treasurer Floyd Laughren will take millions of dollars from the pockets of already overburdened Ontario taxpayers. On that day, the NDP will begin collecting a full year's worth of tax increases over a six-month period, retroactive to January 1, while raising Ontario's personal income tax rate three percentage points, to 58% of the basic federal tax. Provincial income taxes will now be at 61% of the federal rate. New fees and fee increases will pull another \$220 million into the NDP coffers.

It is small wonder that Ontario citizens have begun to establish taxpayer coalitions across the province to articulate their concerns about the lack of accountability in public spending. Ontario property taxpayers have had to shoulder the burden of increased education costs. Hundreds of millions of dollars are also being lost annually due to the government's refusal to make our social assistance and health care systems more accountable.

I am pleased to greet today in the Legislature Mr

Frank Gue, the president of the Halton Taxpayers' Coalition, together with members of his executive, Barb Newham, Roger Love, Leo Haber and Niel Howie.

The goals of the coalition are to obtain value for tax dollars in public spending, to eliminate waste in public spending and to encourage elected representatives to make responsible judgements concerning these issues. It is my hope that the Premier and Treasurer are listening to their message. The taxpayers have had enough, and they deserve to be listened to.

JAEMI AND TAELOU DOUGLAS

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** On March 22, 1993, Chris and Geoff Douglas of Burlington, Ontario, became the proud parents of twin girls, and big sister Sierra became the responsible, proud big sister of these twins. Jaemi Nicole weighed in at five pounds nine ounces and arrived about 3:35 pm, only to be followed immediately and very impatiently by Taelor Jordan, weighing in at six pounds 10 ounces, about three minutes later.

Proud of this occasion are the grandparents, Doreen Bauer and Mac and Connie Douglas of London, Ontario, and my good friends Alan and Diana Kalinowski of Ilderton, Ontario, and also the great-grandparents, Josephine Kalinowski of London, Merle Bauer of Goderich and Selma and Maurice Klumpp of London.

The twins and the family are doing well, and I believe the grandparents have their feet on the ground. We wish everyone the best for the future.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Today I'm calling on Mike Harris and the Tories to vote against Bill 48 on third reading. During second reading, the Conservatives supported the social contract legislation. Harris and the Conservative caucus have tried to have it both ways. They've spoken out of both sides of their mouths. First, they bashed the unions and then criticized the government for union bashing. Harris said the \$2 billion in cuts wasn't enough and then he accused the NDP of going too far to get the \$2 billion.

Before the second reading vote, I repeatedly asked the Conservative caucus to join Lyn McLeod and the Liberals and to vote against Bill 48. Unfortunately, they did not take my advice. But I'm an optimist, and I believe there is still hope. We've seen Mike Harris change his mind before. Do it again, Mike.

Perhaps you'll listen to the words of the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto. They have great concerns about the future cost of this legislation. Here is what they say: "The entire structure and functioning of Ontario's public sector will be irrevocably changed for the worse." Another quote: They say this legislation "poses a serious threat to private sector employers who provide services to government on a contract basis." They say about this legislation that it is "liable to serve



as a deterrent to future private business investments in this province."

I say to the Conservative caucus that bang, bang, bang is bad, bad, bad. This legislation is fundamentally flawed. Do the right thing: Join the Liberal caucus and help us to defeat Bill 48.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** This morning I was happy to sponsor a press conference at which the Ontario Safety League, the Driving School Association of Ontario and the Road Safety Educators' Association announced a step forward in road safety.

As of July 1, 1993, the Driving School Association of Ontario becomes the approving agent of driving schools whose courses will be recognized by the insurance industry through premium discounts offered to graduates.

This is the first time that the driving school industry has attempted to speak with a common voice. The move towards self-regulation is a commendable one, and the effort to promote quality and uniform standards within the driving education industry deserves praise.

The work of those involved in establishing this coalition of road safety educators should be commended. This is a model example of cooperation within the road safety industry, as the coalition includes representatives from a variety of road users, including cyclists, automobile drivers and truckers.

Congratulations to the members of the coalition for taking this initiative and advancing the interests of all road users by focusing on road safety through education. Given that over 1,100 people are killed each year on our roads and highways, any step to end this carnage must be encouraged. Raising awareness and changing attitudes through education is the best way to achieve safety on our roads and highways.

#### CANADA DAY

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** In celebration of Canada Day, East York will be holding its 26th annual Canada Day festivities this Thursday. Included in these events is a Canadian citizenship court being held at the East York Civic Centre, a motorcade from Howard Talbot Park to Dieppe Park and a parade marching through East York, ending at Stan Wadlow Park, where a variety of activities are planned.

I am pleased to again be able to participate in this wonderful community event. The involvement of so many local organizations is a reflection of the close-knit community that East York represents.

At my booth this year I will be making available tree seedlings for a small donation to the Conservation Foundation of Greater Toronto. As part of its 1993 fund-raising campaign, the foundation is attempting to raise \$500,000 from the private sector. These funds will be used, along with other sources of funding, to begin

the rehabilitation of the Don Valley brickworks, a site located in my riding. The brickworks, as many of you are aware, was acquired by the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority in 1989 and is designated as an area of natural and scientific interest because of its historical, environmental and geological significance.

I hope that in your own communities you have the same opportunity to participate in such a worthwhile activity, and I wish you a happy Canada Day.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to welcome to our chamber this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, the Honourable Bruce Anthony Chamberlain, the president of the Legislative Council, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. He is accompanied by his wife, Mrs Chamberlain. Welcome to our assembly.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I am surprised that the Treasurer is not here today. We're getting so close to the biggest tax grab in our provincial history.

I noticed, by the way, and the Premier probably knows this, that they're erecting three booths out in front of the treasury offices even now as we speak. I presume those are probably to take in the extra money they're going to take from all the people starting July 1.

But my question is to the Premier. I'd like to ask if the Premier would—sorry, the Premier seems to be otherwise occupied at the moment, looking for his answers. He's ready now, I'm sure.

On previous occasions my leader, Lyn McLeod, has asked the Premier to tell the people of the province how his very badly assembled Bill 48, the social contract bill, will operate in certain sectors of our economy. She asked him about how it would affect teachers' salaries and specifically what it would do to the grid system. She asked to have him explain how the redeployment of people laid off as a result of the social contract would work. She asked about the special leaves, the 12 days off for critical activities. She asked about exemptions from the program, and she asked about the effect the social contract would have on Ontario Hydro.

I'm asking the Premier, will he today answer those questions?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** This is question period, and I'll be glad to answer any specific questions that are put to me to the very best of my ability.

1350

**Mr Elston:** Basically, what he has said was that he wants to gloss over all of those errors in his bill. He doesn't want to answer any of those questions at this point. He could have chosen to answer anything about the teachers' grid, he could have chosen to answer any

of those other items that I listed, but let me give him one single issue for him to address so that he can specifically tell us what he thinks the effect of his legislation will be.

While members of labour organizations have said they'd no longer support his program, while the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto says it no longer supports his program because it is flawed, let him explain to the people who work and who are working at Ontario Hydro, even as we speak, on their expenditure control program, which they implemented long before he started his, let him explain how the social contract's new target of some \$100 million will affect not only the workers and the people at Ontario Hydro, but the rates that are to be paid by the people who use electrical power in this province. Will he do that?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I think I can answer at least part of the question. First of all, the rate proposal that's been put forward by the board at Ontario Hydro, which provides for no rate increases next year, stands.

**Mr Elston:** That was before you asked them for \$100 million.

**Hon Mr Rae:** No, I'm sorry. I'm being heckled mercilessly by the member. It's very hard to—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** It's over you, Bob.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** And another one, the member for York Centre, who is absolutely brutal, sitting in his new seat which he himself has referred to as the ejection seat.

I would say in answer to the member, and I've discussed this directly with the chairman of Ontario Hydro, that Ontario Hydro has gone through and is going through a major restructuring and is in the middle of very intensive discussions with its own employees with respect to restructuring and with respect to the impact of this restructuring on the workplace.

What we have said is that with respect to the government's legislation and with respect to the approach that's being taken, in any negotiation the amounts that have already been negotiated by Ontario Hydro will be fully credited to Ontario Hydro and will be fully taken into account in terms of assessing what the bottom line is. The government does not want to do anything which would negatively affect or impact Hydro's financial integrity and its ability to meet its own targets, which are exceptionally important.

**The Speaker:** Final supplementary.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** To the Premier: I wonder if I could ask you a very specific direct question along the same lines as the member for Bruce has just done. It has to do with the 12 days that you have suggested municipalities negotiate with their workers to find their savings.

You've admitted, and I think would agree, that in many cases the municipalities are finding a shortfall, that the 12 days simply do not generate the savings, the target that you've asked for. These municipal people have gone to the staff in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, they've talked to Bill Freeman, policy adviser to the minister, he's referred them to Nancy Bardecki in financial services and Miss Bardecki has given them advice, one of four options.

The first option: If it doesn't meet the target, negotiate more than 12 days. Even though the legislation doesn't allow for that, negotiate more than 12 days. The second option is service cuts. The third option Miss Bardecki has suggested is layoffs. You have said you don't want either service cuts or layoffs. The fourth option, interestingly enough, that Miss Bardecki has given to the municipal sector is to increase property taxes.

Premier, will you confirm that those are the four pieces of advice being given out by senior staff in Municipal Affairs, and which one of those options do you recommend, sir?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I wouldn't tell a mayor how to run his shop in terms of those kinds of decisions.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orillia):** You have. That's what Bill 38 is all about.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** What we're providing is legislation which provides a framework and provides an ability on the part of employers and employees to come together and to reach conclusions. There's no one single answer with respect to what we're putting forward. If you say that it could be all of the above, I would say to the honourable member that the mix of options that are chosen and negotiated is precisely the one that your own leader, three or four days ago, was standing in her place and saying, "Give to the local municipalities the power to reach agreements that they can reach." Then we say, "That's exactly what we're going to do," and you turn around and say, "You mustn't do it."

The Liberal Party can't have it both ways. You have to deal with and recognize the problem. If you agree with the need to save \$2 billion, if you're going to go around and say to business, "Yes, we're championing your cause," if you're going to turn around and say to labour, "Yes, we're championing your cause," make up your minds. Get off the fence and tell us where you stand on this question of expenditure reduction, because you're not even in the ballpark.

AIR QUALITY

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a question to the Minister of Environment and Energy. I'm informed that he was to be here. He is not yet here. Is he coming? If he is, I will stand down my question to the minister.



**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** The door just opened. He may be on his way if you're lucky. The door just opened and he has arrived.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Mississauga North has the floor. He may wish to place his question now.

**Mr Offer:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. That got the Minister of Environment and Energy out. I'm wondering how many are back there right now.

My question is to the Minister of Environment and Energy and it concerns your lagging commitment to improving air quality, especially in the area of low-smog gasoline.

You will know that nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds are the major precursors to smog pollution. Approximately half of the nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds present in the atmosphere today are emitted by automobiles.

Pollution Probe has indicated that Toronto is not only the smog capital of Canada; it has an air quality that is worse than some major cities in the United States, including Chicago, Atlanta and Boston. As you know, summer has traditionally been the worst season for smog pollution in this province, and this year residents can expect it to be no different.

What are you and your government doing to prevent smog pollution which is being emitted largely by automobiles in this province?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** I want to apologize to the House. I was dealing with a matter related to a first nation. It came up as an emergency; otherwise I would have been here.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Oh, my, what a busy minister.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** It was an important matter.

The member raises a very important issue with regard to ground level ozone. There is no question that the automobile is the main contributor to NO<sub>x</sub> and this is a problem, particularly in the summer months. We are currently working on regulations that will be coming forward in due time. I would say to the member that I appreciate his question and I would certainly look forward to giving him further information on the supplementary.

1400

**Mr Offer:** I would hope that the minister would have been quite well aware of this very important problem, especially as it affects health. I think you should be aware, from your previous response, that the only conclusion one can draw through watching these parliamentary proceedings is that your government is doing nothing.

I think we have to recognize that the human health effect of ground-level ozone is an increase in breathing disorders such as coughing, wheezing, decreased lung function and increased mortality rates. According to the Lung Association and Pollution Probe, the most at risk are people with chronic heart and respiratory disease, the very young, the very old and also people who exercise vigorously when ground-level ozone is high.

I would like to remind you that when we were in government we took action. The member for St Catharines, when Minister of the Environment, took action to reduce smog emissions from automobiles as a first step within our overall strategy to improve air quality throughout the province.

Since you have been in government you have done nothing while other jurisdictions such as British Columbia, the northeastern United States, such as New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and other states such as California, all have enacted stricter regulations than are now in existence in this province.

We need action. Will you give a commitment today that you will immediately pass a regulation requiring further restrictions on low-smog gasoline as part of a larger strategy to improve air quality in this province and for its citizens?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I appreciate the member's question and I would reiterate that we are indeed working on a regulation. I'm sure that he and his party would not want us to immediately pass a regulation without proper consultation. That would be most inappropriate. Obviously, we need to consult with Pollution Probe and other environmental groups as well as members of the fuel industry and the automobile industry and municipalities, to ensure that we have a regulation which is appropriate.

I think it's unfair of the member to suggest that this government has done nothing when one recognizes the tremendous commitment this government has made to urban transit, which is designed to get people out of the automobile and into urban transit as a way of dealing with our environmental difficulties.

**Mr Offer:** The minister indicates that they do not want to rush into a regulation. For three years, this government has done nothing. They put a new definition to the meaning of "rush." I would like to remind the minister that in 1991 your predecessor signed a national agreement with every provincial minister of the environment and the federal government as well. That agreement committed your government, two years ago, to implementing a plan to reduce smog pollution in this province of Ontario and with other ministers throughout the country of Canada.

Your government has done nothing. In your inaction in implementing the provision of this initiative you have, I believe, breached this agreement. I believe you

have to explain to the members of this Legislature and to the people in this province why you have breached a plan signed in 1991, a plan which would have committed your government to action in this very important area.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member should know that this government will live up to its commitments.

**The Speaker:** New question, third party. The member for Carleton? Is there anyone from the third party who wishes to place a question? The member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to say I think we're okay to go now. The leader's ready for his question.

**The Speaker:** Very helpful.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** That was one of the more appropriate points of order I've heard in a long time. Some of them really aren't points of order at all.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. As early as tomorrow, we may be proceeding with the next stage of the social contract legislation in committee. In that regard, Premier, this morning I shared with you some of our draft amendments in the hope that changes to Bill 48 will address the principles that we want to see met.

My caucus believes that restraint legislation in its final form must permanently and structurally reduce the size and cost of government, not just be a quick fix. Your caucus, I know, had some time this morning to discuss the intent of those amendments and your amendments. Indeed the board of trade has put forward identical amendments to ours in a very responsible, constructive way to make Bill 48 workable. I commend them for that too.

Can you tell me the thinking of yourself and your caucus with regard to those amendments and, secondly, do you agree that with whatever language we end up, whatever amendments and whatever language, the goal is at the end of the control period there will be no snapback provisions, no ballooning provisions, no contingent liability on any of the employers across the province? Would you agree with that?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** First of all, let me say to the honourable member that I appreciated getting a copy of the discussions, the proposed amendments, and I gather from the covering letter that there may in fact still be others that will be forthcoming. I don't know, but there was that indication. I would say that we take those amendments very seriously.

With respect to what's being suggested—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** Again, Mr Speaker, the noise level is so high, I think I'll have to—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**y Hon Mr Rae:** I would say that we are looking seriously at the amendments and obviously dealing with the precise wording of them. I would also say to the member that obviously one of the objectives that has been set out in the government's whole approach to this is that, as a result of what takes place over the three-year period, there will be a reduction in the size of government. That's, I think, very much what is in the cards in terms of the overall size of the public sector.

Some parts of the public sector will grow. One doesn't want to say that no parts of it will ever be allowed to grow, but overall there's a need for greater rationalization, there's a need for a significant adjustment in the size of the public sector. That's one of the reasons we're bringing in the legislation, because we genuinely believe that it requires either a negotiated social contract or negotiations within the context of legislation, which is where we are now, in order to deal with this very—

**The Speaker:** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Mr Harris:** Premier, I think you would know that we agree with the intent of downsizing permanently the size and cost of government, as does the board of trade, which I met with today, and everybody we've talked to. The principle is really not in question, except for a few people who seem to have a vested interest other than the good of the province.

But in the covering letter today, which accompanied draft amendments, I indicated as well that we were prepared to look at another amendment for which we didn't have the legal amendment language, but I'd like to share this with you today. This amendment would reduce wages by 5% across the board on the next anniversary date of a contract and it would continue for three years.

However, we would encourage with this amendment the social contract talks to carry on for the three-year period, as they're doing with the joint management committee of the medical social contract agreement that was negotiated last year, and that any savings that can be negotiated and achieved in wage costs in the three-year control period could then be redistributed as raises back to individual employees.

This would encourage social contract partners to work cooperatively through the three-year control period to find new and creative and efficient ways that we all want of delivering services. It would allow for gains through attrition over the three-year control period. It would respect the anniversary date of contracts and it would guarantee that it would permanently—

**The Speaker:** Would the leader place a question, please.



**Mr Harris:** —downsize the cost to taxpayers by 5% of the wage component of the broad public sector.

Would you or your caucus or in discussions today be supportive of this kind of amendment that would avoid the panic of having to have the agreements finalized before the social contract talks come in but in fact would encourage and provide incentives for the talks to continue through the three years?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Again, without committing ourselves to any particular wording, the principle of wanting to maintain a very major level of negotiation and discussion between and among all the partners is going to be required. This is not something that, having started in earnest in April, in fact can simply be turned off.

The requirement that people discuss with each other on an ongoing basis the impact of the fiscal realities that surround the province is, I think, essential. We tried to do it through negotiation, without legislation. Now we have legislation which provides a framework and we think a very clear incentive for people to bargain. But we're looking very closely at whatever suggestions are coming forward. If there were any suggestions coming forward from that side, obviously we'd be looking at them as well.

1410

**Mr Harris:** Respecting the anniversary date is, I believe, an important principle that has been respected by federal and provincial governments in the past when this type of legislation was needed. Secondly, having an across-the-board 5% cut kick in, then with negotiations there to take attrition and other things into account, would truly encourage employees, I believe, to find more efficient ways of permanently downsizing government.

But in conjunction with that, something else we think would be very important: When, two days from now, your budget proposal is to cut the transfer payments to our transfer partners by 5% of the wage component of all those transfer partners—municipalities, school boards, hospitals, colleges, universities, all those receiving money—even though the legislation will not be passed, even though the clear direction will not be there, the intent was to cut those transfer payments as of July 1. In conjunction with our most recent amendment that we're releasing today, would you not agree with me that the 5% transfer cuts to our transfer partners ought also to kick in on the anniversary date of those contracts?

**Hon Mr Rae:** We are obviously looking at whatever approaches are being put forward by constructive individuals, and we'll continue to do that.

I would say to the honourable member, with respect to the government's decision to signal very clearly this is the fiscal reality and we all have to adjust to it, that we in a sense allowed the negotiations initially to proceed without taking that step. When the public sector

coalition walked out of the talks and tore up the social contract proposal without putting forward an alternative, we at that point decided that we have to send signals through the financial transfers that would create a more realistic climate.

The fact of the matter is that we are determined not to exceed the budgetary requirements that we have. We have made serious commitments to the taxpayers of the province with regard to what will happen in terms of the budget and we have to live up to those requirements. Therefore, we have to meet the fiscal climate that's there, have to reach whatever agreements within that climate. So we intend to proceed with the cuts in transfers on July 1.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My second question is also to the Premier. Yesterday, Premier, you ducked a question on your government's plan to drive the private sector out of community-based services for long-term care, but it's a question for which you personally owe us, the Legislature, the people of this province, particularly those who will be receiving services and those delivering them, an answer.

We have legislation before us which is intended to cut the wage bill of government, yet your plans for long-term care will add thousands of people and millions of dollars to that same government payroll with this attitude that only government employees can provide services.

This just doesn't make any sense—on the one hand to be talking about downsizing the cost of government, looking for new, creative, entrepreneurial, efficient ways to deliver services—for you to be proceeding that way. It makes no sense at all. At a time when we should be looking to the private sector to help provide additional services, why would you deliberately set about with a policy to close down those services that already exist and are being delivered by the private sector?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** The minister has, I think, indicated clearly to the House yesterday and for purposes of, if you like, making it clear from my perspective—and I've had a long-term interest in this issue. In fact the first speech I gave in the Legislature as leader of the third party, standing in the place of the leader of the third party, had to do with what was going on in Ontario's nursing home system.

I would say to the honourable member, I think to some extent he is misconstruing the government's proposal. What we're saying is that as there is going to be a major expansion into community care and into care that will be provided in the community, the government's preference—

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** You are trying to put them out of business. You are going to cut services and raise costs.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** We are the government and we are, I think, entitled to state this, just as other governments have done with respect to services: From the point of view of public policy, our preference is to see that services are provided on a non-profit basis by non-profit agencies.

The only area where I would disagree with the honourable member is, for example, when he says people have to work for the government. No, that's not the case. If you work for the Red Cross, you don't work for the government. There are a number of agencies which are capable of providing a service on a non-profit basis. Frankly, we feel that's a more efficient way to proceed, and it ensures and guarantees that the level of services will in fact—in terms of the expansion of services, in terms of new services.

**Mrs Caplan:** Higher costs, less services. Every study in the ministry says it is higher cost.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Let me say, Mr Speaker—

**The Speaker:** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I'm being heckled again by the former Minister of Health. When the member for Oriole was the Minister of Health, it was her government that said the expansion in the nursing home sector would take place in the non-profit sector and not in the for-profit sector. So I would say to the honourable member, you practise one thing when you're in government, and as soon as you revert to the opposition, you decide to attack, attack, attack. It's not good enough.

**Mr Harris:** The Premier is quite right. He is carrying on a policy the Liberals started. We objected to it then, we objected to it when the member for Oriole brought those policies in, and we object to it now.

Almost all the affected workers, the thousands who stand to lose their jobs because of your plans, are women. The industry estimates some 10,000 jobs could be lost. The minister disputes this, but we'd be interested in knowing what studies you have as to how many jobs will be lost or how much money it will save.

If you, as the former government before you, the Liberals, think the non-profit sector is better, more efficient, why are you not prepared to let it compete with the private sector? Why not have them bid on the jobs? Why not let the non-profit sector of course exist and of course be there, but force it to compete and tender and bid to provide these services with the private sector? Why won't you do that?

*Applause.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Again, I would say to the honourable member, he talks about which government did what. It was your government, the one that lasted for 42 years,

that said the hospitals in the province of Ontario would operate on a non-profit basis. You're the ones who phased out private-profit hospitals. You're the ones who said private-profit hospitals will not be allowed to operate in the province and it will be operated on a non-profit basis.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** We had a balance.

**Hon Mr Rae:** That was your government that did that. It wasn't a social democratic government. It wasn't a Liberal government. It was a Conservative government that did it.

Why did they do it? Because they decided it was a better way to ensure accountability and it was a better way to ensure that services were being delivered directly to people. It was on that basis that it was decided, rather than see an expansion of the commercial sector. You're the ones who understood that when you were in office. Now that you're in opposition, you'll take up—

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Read our policy. It was a balance. You know it was a balance. What a bogus argument.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Simcoe West.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Any grievance, any cause, as long as it gets you a headline and as long as it gets you applause in the Legislature. It's not good enough.

When you were in government, those are exactly the steps you took to deal with it. You didn't expand the hospitals on a for-profit basis. You didn't expand education in the 19th century on a for-profit basis, but we expanded into public education. Every time we've taken a major decision in this province to expand public services, we've done it on a non-profit basis, whether the Liberals did it or the Tories did it or the New Democrats did it.

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** It's not a matter of ideology; it's a matter of common sense and public service. That's the basis upon which we've made our decision.

1420

**Mr Harris:** I think if the Premier will reflect on the education system, on home care, on long-term care, on nursing homes, our government encouraged, supported and allowed the private sector to go out there and compete with the public sector, and that's what we're asking you to do today.

Let's face it, your government is charging ahead with this ideologically driven plan without any idea of its impact. You continue to follow the Liberal lead in long-term care for one reason and one reason only. It's the same reason you continue the Liberal housing policies that don't help those who truly need help, yet cost the taxpayer untold extra hundreds of millions of dollars. It's the same reason you're driving the private sector out of day care. That reason is Liberal-socialist



ideology at any cost.

How can you on the one hand say you're going to cut the compensation costs of the public sector through Bill 48, and on the other hand continue to increase the size and cost of government with your long-term care plans?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I always appreciate these tirades from the leader of the third party. I haven't been called a socialist in a long time and I finally have been.

*Laughter.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** I knew I'd get someone to laugh.

I would say in all seriousness to the member that, again, I think we have to have a sense of the history of this province. How have we expanded major public services? You make the comparison with child care. I would say to you: Right on, you're right. When we expand child care in this province, we're going to expand it not as a kind of McMuffin approach to child care; we're going to expand it on the basis of a public service. That's the basis upon which we're going to expand it. That's the basis upon which we expanded public education in the 19th century. That's the basis upon which we expanded medicare in the 20th century.

We're not going to turn the public services of this province holus-bolus over to for-profit commercial operators. We're simply not going to do that. We're going to allow a place for the private sector. We're not ruling out a place for the private sector. All we're saying is that the priority, as far as this government is concerned, for expansion will be in the not-for-profit sector, in the charitable non-profit, voluntary non-profit, non-governmental non-profit, broader public sector. That's where we're putting our emphasis, and as New Democrats we're proud to be putting our emphasis there, very proud indeed.

#### ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Premier and it has to do with the issue of jobs and the economy. We in the opposition, at least, continue to see an awful lot of pain out there. The unemployment rate—and we're coming up on three years of your government—according to your own numbers in the budget, approaches 14%. We see young people unemployed for long periods of time. I think all the members daily have calls from people who are desperate about the economy. We continue to see businesses closing. We see a continuation of pain, and frankly, a fair bit of pessimism out there. On the other hand, I think you have a different view of it. I think your view is that the recession has ended and that the Ontario economy has turned the corner.

Could you explain to all of the people of Ontario how you have reached this determination that the recession is over and that the Ontario economy has turned the corner?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** First of all, I want to say

that I guess the honourable member and I can probably agree on more than his question would permit. I don't think any one of us who has eyes and ears and who cares about this province, and that includes members on all sides of the House, not just New Democrats or Liberals or Conservatives, and people throughout the province—we all realize, and I certainly realize, that there is a lot of pain out there.

I don't think anyone's denying that. I wouldn't deny that for a moment. I wouldn't deny that the recession, depression, whatever you want to call it, the major increase in unemployment that we've seen over the past number of years, and which is only just now beginning to recede, and not as strongly as I would like, has had a very tough effect, a very profound effect on the whole province. I'm not denying that for one instant and I'm not denying that the joblessness has got to be the major challenge facing this economy, facing this country and facing this province. Indeed, I would argue it's facing not only our economy but the American economy, the European economy, everybody, us included, very directly.

I would say to the honourable member that the signs of recovery are, I think, there simply in terms of the number of things that are happening, the number of moves that are being made—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —the increases in investment and so on, the increases in exports, the increases in industrial and manufacturing and other activity. I would say that it's not as great or as strong as I would like. I'm not denying that for a moment. But I would say that if he's suggesting that somehow this government believes there's no pain or difficulty out there and everything is just hunky-dory, then I think he's got the wrong impression of my own views. I've never suggested that. I have suggested that there are signs of recovery—

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —and that we have to do everything we can to sustain that recovery. We've also been very candid in saying this recovery is going to take some time to have its full impact across the province.

**Mr Phillips:** The reason I sometimes, frankly, get angry with the Premier—I am quoting you, Premier. These aren't my words; they're your words. You said, "The recession has ended and the Ontario economy has turned the corner." You based your budget on that, and in less than two days we're going to see taxes go up dramatically in the province. I realize you may stand up and rail, "Well, we've got to do it," but those taxes going up were based on your determination that the economy had turned the corner.

Now I hear from you today something a little differ-

ent: weak signs of recovery; things may not be recovering as well as you would like. I quote your words, "The recession has ended." Those thousands of people out there without jobs listening to you don't believe the recession has ended, don't believe Ontario has turned the corner.

Have you now determined that the economy is not recovering as quickly as you thought in the budget, and are we still putting ourselves at substantial risk by a substantial increase in personal income tax in another two days that will take a substantial amount of money out of the economy? We all recognize the need to control the deficit, but that increase in taxes was based on a strong economic recovery. Are we putting at risk more downturn in the economy as a result of your proposals on the tax increases?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I honestly don't believe we are. Obviously, as a government, we would not be taking steps that we thought would have that effect.

I would say to the honourable member that I appreciate his advice and listen very carefully to his questions. He tells me that the Liberal Party of course accepts the need to get the deficit under control. Let me say that not only is the Liberal Party opposed to tax increases; they're opposed to the social contract and to the deficit reduction, and judging from their questions, they're opposed to the entire expenditure reduction plan.

I say to the honourable member, and I say with great respect, because I spent a lot of time talking to the business community and they're a little bewildered by where the Liberal Party really stands: You're opposed to expenditure reduction, you're opposed to tax increases and you're opposed to the social contract. You're opposed, opposed, opposed, and you also say you're opposed to the deficit. It doesn't add up. The numbers don't jibe.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I was under the impression that in this House it is inappropriate to mislead the House. Is that not correct?

**The Speaker:** The member is correct, yes, of course. At this point I would not accuse anyone of doing that.

**Mr Bradley:** Then why does the Premier continue to make statements that are factually incorrect?

**The Speaker:** I knew that the member for St Catharines would not suggest that someone was misleading the House.

#### FIRST MINISTERS' MEETING

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. Yesterday, by indicating that you would not attend the briefing for our new Prime Minister of Canada to make sure that 40% of Canadians' views would be heard before she goes to the G-7 summit, I suggest to you that you sent a signal out, perhaps inadvertently, that partisan politics is more important

than Ontario's interest and making sure that a newly elected Prime Minister who does not come from Ontario has the full benefit of the government and the Premier of the province of Ontario.

Are you prepared, as it will cost you nothing more than a few hours of your time and a flight to Vancouver, to reconsider and make sure that our new Prime Minister, regardless of political affiliation, has the benefit of understanding Ontario's very serious situation before she goes to the G-7 summit?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I will not rise to the bait and will simply indicate that no, I'm not prepared to attend the meeting.

**Mr Harris:** As it appears as though at least seven premiers, and perhaps all, do wish to make sure that the new Prime Minister fully understands their provinces' concerns, and as I personally believe that Ontario is suffering through a very difficult period of time, I think before the Prime Minister goes to the G-7 summit she should in fact get the benefit of a full briefing of Ontario's concerns. As you won't go, will you send me?

1430

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't think the legislative forum is any place where the member for Nipissing should expect to be paid back for his support of the government's social contract legislation.

**The Speaker:** The member knows he does not have a point of order. The Premier may wish to respond.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I must confess that the thought hadn't even occurred to me, and I appreciate the honourable member raising it. I would say to him very directly that I really do believe there are major federal-provincial issues that are going to have to be addressed that are substantive, that are deep and long-term and require a major investment of time and energy on the part of whatever government is elected in the next federal election.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Thursday of last week, I believe, the physicians in my community held a public meeting in order to bring people together to talk about some very real issues around the health care sector. Some of the things that were commented on at that particular meeting were somewhat disconcerting, to say the least, not only to some of the people who were there but generally for the public of Ontario.

One of the things that was asserted was that under the plan now in negotiation between the Ministry of Health and the Ontario Medical Association, OHIP would limit the access to health care and the number of services to people.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Bisson:** I know health care may not be important



to some of the members of the opposition, but it's certainly important for the people of northern Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place his question, please.

**Mr Bisson:** I'll repeat the question, Mr Speaker. There have been allegations made on the part of the Ontario Medical Association that if a child has an ear infection, they would only be able to access the doctor's office once per year. I want the Minister of Health to be able to clarify that particular position for not only the people of Cochrane South, but for the people of this province.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I welcome the opportunity to clarify some of the allegations that have been made, regrettably, by the Ontario Medical Association in its advertising campaign. Let me say as categorically as I can that this government will never do anything that would limit medically necessary services in this province. I greatly regret the fact that fear is being caused in the minds of the constituents of the honourable member and of other people around this province, fear that I think has more to do with not the limitation of services but perhaps some limitations on the income of the people who deliver those services. I think it's completely unfounded.

**Mr Bisson:** The follow-up to that is one of the issues that was talked about there, a real issue with regard to the number of patients doctors have to deal with over a period. One of the ways the ministry is looking at dealing with that with the OMA is the question of a threshold on their incomes. I know the ministry has been working at trying to deal with the question of thresholds and recognizes the specific difference in northern Ontario: the number of patients doctors need to treat due to the very nature of having a limited number of doctors in northern Ontario. I wonder if the minister can clarify how the threshold would be applied to northern doctors in underserved areas.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** As the member will know, that is part of the negotiations we are having with the Ontario Medical Association that are ongoing and that I hope will lead to some long-term and permanent resolutions of what has been a very long-standing problem: how to attract physicians to remoter parts of northern Ontario.

As the member will know, without thresholds and cash and travel incentives, there would be even fewer doctors in the remote parts of northern Ontario today than there were 10 years ago. In fact, I gather the ratio has increased so that the doctor-to-patient ratio is now, in northern Ontario, what it was in southern Ontario 10 years ago. At the same time, we are still having to fly in doctors from Israel, from South Africa, from Australia, because it is impossible to get locums to serve in northern Ontario.

I hope that in negotiations with the OMA we can

come to a resolution of those issues, because I know the member's constituents, as well as all the residents of areas that are underserved, hope that this would be the case.

#### CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. You know and I know that crime among youth, especially young offenders, has risen severely, in some areas by as much as 50%. You know and I know that there's a desperate need for a secure-custody facility for young offenders in eastern Ontario.

A committed group of citizens in Ottawa-Carleton, including professionals, has been meeting over the last number of years. They have met every criterion of your ministry. In fact, they received complete approval for their project in 1991, a full two years ago.

To this date, no funds have flowed for the construction of this project. Why do you continue to refuse to meet with the board of directors of the William E. Hay Centre, and why do you continue to resist giving them any real reasons for your refusal to flow these long-awaited, much-needed funds?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I have to say to the member that I'm not familiar with the particulars. I would be happy to look into it and report back, if need be. I wasn't aware that there had been a request for a meeting that had been turned down, and I'd be happy to look into that as well.

**Mrs O'Neill:** That answer's appalling. I've got copies of each of the letters that have been sent to the minister, and some of them are as old as three months. The most recent one is six weeks ago. He doesn't get his mail? I get mine. Then I'll have to tell you a little bit about this project.

There are young offenders waiting in Ottawa-Carleton. On a weekly basis, they're being transferred out of our community for stays as short as 15 days to facilities in Uxbridge and in Pickering, hundreds of miles from their families and from the professionals who care for them.

I remind you that we're talking about 12- to 15-year-olds being shunted around this province from eastern Ontario because this government—and you yourself have just suggested that you don't get your mail, or you haven't got the political will to find out what's going on in eastern Ontario.

Your own ministry has determined that eastern Ontario is underserved in secure custody and detention for young offenders. I ask you again, will you assure this House of your commitment to provincial funding for the youth of eastern Ontario in a project that has received all approvals; services that are needed and are crucial to the futures of our youth in eastern Ontario?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I appreciate the importance of the issue and I do find it unfortunate that the member has chosen to categorize my first answer as being somehow uncaring about the issue. She would know that when she has brought issues to my attention, they certainly have been followed up.

I'm quite conscious of the fact that there is a problem with respect to the general issue of how we provide for facilities. This is not a problem that afflicts only eastern Ontario; there have been other instances in other parts of the province where we've managed to deal with the issue. I will be happy to look into the issue and hopefully be able to look at what resolution may be possible.

#### PHOTO RADAR

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Since your government's decision to introduce photo radar, you have failed to offer any empirical evidence of the reduction of accidents in those administrations which already have these devices.

In a recent article in the *Toronto Star*, which I'm sure you've read, it suggests that the principal reason for buying these pieces of equipment is revenue generation. I wonder if you could respond to that charge, or is this simply another tax grab?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** With respect to the member opposite, he has a tendency, when we're talking about safety measures, to confuse the issues. It's not a tax grab. Everyone knows that speed kills. It's a safety initiative. We're hoping to break even in terms of revenue; no more than that.

1440

Simply put, and by way of conclusion to the preliminary question, photo radar is an enforcement mechanism for those who exceed the speed limit. It's no more than that and it's no less than that.

**Mr Turnbull:** I have to say the minister has failed to dispel the concerns that are felt on this side of the House. I would ask you then, would you commit today to dedicating the net proceeds, after the cost of the equipment, to the police force that is operating this and commit that it will not disappear into general revenue, so that those moneys can be used by the local police force for safety enforcement?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The member goes from the obsessive to the pathological. This issue is a matter for the Treasurer to decide, whether the pool of money, if any, will go to the general fund. I hear the member loud and clear and I indeed sympathize with the proposal that it should be dedicated or that part of it be dedicated. I will simply pass the comments or suggestion along to the Minister of Finance.

#### COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** My question is for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

This government, as you know, has started out on a very aggressive agenda to put Ontario back to work. As part of that agenda, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade recently announced a new initiative to actually put Ontario back to work, which I am hoping will have some significant application for northern Ontario. I'm speaking of the community economic development or Jobs Ontario Community Action fund.

Your ministry has been named as leading this program in northern Ontario. Could you explain to me how you see this helping the north in these difficult times and how it is different from some of the important and helpful things we are doing now?

**Hon Shelley Martel (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** I appreciate the question from the member.

First of all, how I think this initiative will help the north is in two ways. The member will know, and so will other members from northern Ontario, that there are some very dramatic changes occurring in the pulp and paper and mining sectors in northern Ontario. Many communities are trying to look at economic development in the broadest sense of the word, including tourism, culture, education, social services, health etc. The initiative is focused on promoting that look at economic development in the broadest sense and providing capital dollars to fund those kinds of projects, so it fits very well with the work that is starting to happen in northern communities now.

Secondly, there are a number of changes in legislation that I think are going to be very helpful to northern communities. First of all, we know that many entrepreneurs have good ideas but can't get money from the banks, and sometimes even government programs aren't flexible enough to allow them to fund those ideas, so legislation will be passed in this House that will allow loan corporations to be set up, to allow municipalities or communities of interest to loan money to small businesses to get those ideas off the ground.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Miss Martel:** A number of communities we know would have liked to have entered into joint ventures with businesses but were not permitted to do so under the Municipal Act. We're going to be changing that act to allow them to do that.

So I think it is different, because we now have capital money that will allow for projects in the broader sense of economic development and the legislative tools to allow communities to enter into ventures with other partners in the community.

**Mr Martin:** I'd also like to ask the minister, in light of a meeting I had last Friday in my own community in an attempt to try to explain these new and important initiatives, just how it will specifically apply to a place



like, say, Sault Ste Marie.

**Hon Miss Martel:** Part of the aim of the program is to allow many more people to participate in economic development in our communities. Traditionally, economic development has been moved forward by municipal council, and in some cases there has not been a broad representation by many people in the community who have an interest in the community and how it moves forward. We are encouraging projects to come forward not only from municipalities but many other non-profit groups, aboriginal groups, minority groups etc who have an interest in moving their community forward.

The other aim was to coordinate some of the activities of government ministries for the first time. There are a number of ministries in northern and southern Ontario that provide funding for community economic development, but traditionally they have not worked very well together to coordinate those activities on behalf of the communities. In northern Ontario we have a regional team in northeastern and northwestern Ontario, one located in Timmins, the other located in Thunder Bay, and we will accept all of those projects from those groups. I would encourage people in Sault Ste Marie who have an interest and who have a proposal to submit those to the Timmins office.

#### ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I have a question to the Minister of Health. I have a draft of a confidential Ministry of Health policy proposal from the AIDS working group within your own ministry. As you know, this has been in existence for up to a year. A friend of mine was working on this, and unfortunately because of the delay in acting on this policy proposal he has died in the interim from AIDS. There's been a delay on this. The previous minister will know that that person locked himself to your door because of that delay.

As part of this policy proposal, there's a suggestion with respect to catastrophic illness funding for AIDS and HIV drugs, there's a recommendation related to that. Is the minister planning on proceeding with that, and if so, when?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** First of all, let me respond to what I think is the unfortunate preamble to the member's question, because this province, under my predecessor the member for Beaches-Woodbine, has taken leadership across this country in not only the establishment of an AIDS bureau and an AIDS advisory committee but in fact putting in place education and prevention to try and deal with this disease, as well as programs in place to help those suffering from the disease.

The question of catastrophic drugs and payment for those drugs, as I'm sure the member well knows, is one that has been under discussion and one that is difficult

and extremely expensive.

I'm glad to be able to tell the member that I have today released a discussion paper with respect to reform of the entire Ontario drug benefit program, which speaks to the difficult questions and decisions that have to be made, such as, if we are to expand eligibility for drugs for people such as those in need and who suffer from AIDS, how do we do that and at the same time contain the costs and make the program more equitable? I anticipate there will be some very serious public policy debate about that over the next two or three months.

**Mr Murphy:** I think it's unfortunate that we didn't get a ministerial statement with respect to that plan in the House. However, there are groups in my riding, like AIDS Action Now and others, that are concerned about this issue. Given that there's going to be some more time frame before there's actually action on this, I'm wondering if the minister is prepared to look at some other concerns that the community has. For example, what is happening in some areas now is finance companies are purchasing the life insurance policies of people with HIV and AIDS at a discounted value in order to give them the money to pay for drugs now. I'm wondering if the Minister of Health would undertake to look into that issue to make sure that people living with HIV and AIDS aren't ripped off.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I find it very distressing if that in fact is happening, and I would be happy to look into that and to talk to whichever of my colleagues in fact might be able to do something about that particular issue. But I would urge the member to engage in discussion with the community that he represents around Ontario drug benefit reform. I would say to him that they are proposals; they are not policy positions at this point, which was why there was no statement in the House with respect to that. I anticipate that we will be able to move forward on reform by the end of this year.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: to correct the record. I know how important it is for members of this House not to mislead the public who are watching with information—

**The Speaker:** The member may correct her record. Go ahead.

**Mrs Caplan:** It was the policy of the Liberal government of which I was a member to support and foster a healthy, competitive environment between the public and private sector in the delivery of services. The Premier today—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. If the member for Oriole wishes to rise and correct her record, could she please indicate on what day the error occurred and what it is

she wishes to correct.

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm rising today to correct the Premier's statement, which was inadvertently false.

**The Speaker:** The member can take her seat. The member knows full well that she can rise to correct her own record, not anyone else's.

**Mrs Caplan:** I know that the Premier would not want to mislead the House, so it's important that he knows the facts.

**The Speaker:** Petitions, the member for Bruce.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** My friend the member for Oriole was just trying to help me with my petition. I agree with her that she was correcting an inadvertent error that was left on the record by the Premier.

1450

### PETITIONS

#### CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food has decided to close Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the veterinary services diagnostic laboratory at the college as of May 1, 1994,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to accept the list of signatures on the attached documents and to reverse the decision to close CCAT and the veterinary services diagnostic lab located on Centralia's campus."

This is signed by three people from the riding of Bruce: Norie Campbell, Janet Chisholm and Shelley MacKay. They have attached to their petition a list of literally hundreds who form part of a single petition with over 4,880 names on it.

I endorse this petition and attach my signature.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan, the social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario, will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across the province,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"The government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and econ-

omic agreement."

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have a petition here from many hardworking members of my constituency, people like Stella Arthur, Suzanne Schembri, Bing Wong and Jim Reid, who petition our assembly:

"Whereas we feel the Canada-US free trade deal has done immeasurable damage to the economy of the province of Ontario, causing a loss of more than 45,000 jobs in Ontario alone; and

"Whereas we feel the proposed North American free trade arrangement will have an even more devastating effect on Ontario, resulting in a loss of not only more jobs but also in a reduction in our environmental standards, our labour standards, workers' rights, social rights and our overall quality of life;

"We petition the Legislature of Ontario to fight this trade deal with whatever means possible, and petition the House of Commons in Ottawa to stop this deal now."

I affix my name thereto.

#### BICYCLING SAFETY

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario.

"Whereas the Parliament of Ontario would make it mandatory for every cyclist to wear a helmet when riding on a public road; and

"Whereas the imposition of this proposed helmet law would create a nightmare from an enforcement standpoint,

"We, the undersigned, your petitioners, call upon the Parliament of Ontario to reject this proposed helmet bylaw."

That's signed by over 200 residents of eastern Ontario.

#### NATIVE HUNTING AND FISHING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas in 1923, seven Ontario bands signed the Williams Treaty, which guaranteed that native peoples would fish and hunt according to provincial and federal conservation laws, like everyone else; and

"Whereas the bands were paid the 1993 equivalent of \$20 million; and

"Whereas that treaty was upheld by Ontario's highest court last year; and

"Whereas Bob Rae is not enforcing existing laws which prohibit native peoples from hunting and fishing out of season; and

"Whereas this will put at risk an already pressured part of Ontario's natural environment,

"We, the undersigned, adamantly demand that the



government honour the principles of fish and wildlife conservation, to respect our native and non-native ancestors and to respect the Williams Treaty."

That's signed by 214 signatures from Norwich, Delhi, Ingersoll, North Bay, Powassan, Sturgeon Falls, Brockville, Fort Frances, Devlin, Tillsonburg and Kitchener, and I've signed by name to it.

#### SCHOOL FACILITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition signed by 1,069 people in my riding of Durham East, and they say as follows:

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the facility utilized by St Stephen's Secondary School in Bowmanville is leased, and we request a capital grant to build a new permanent facility there."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

#### SENIORS' HEALTH SERVICES

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition from approximately 30 seniors from Bewdley, and it is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned members of the Bewdley Senior Citizens' Club, would like to add our voices in opposition to reductions in health care services through the reform of the Ontario drug benefit program. We feel that the present government pensions for our seniors are not adequate to cover any changes, such as user fees, that would increase the financial burden of seniors of this province."

I have signed the petition.

#### ABORTION

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I have a petition which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, protest your government's endorsement of the recommendations of the task group of abortion service providers and the Minister of Health's intention to implement them."

There are hundreds of names on this petition, and I'm happy to write my signature to support it.

#### GAMBLING

**Mrs Ellen MacKinnon (Lambton):** I have a petition sent to me from the Watford-Warwick pastoral charge by the Reverend Aylmer Smith to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. There are about six whereases here that everybody has heard before. I won't bore them with any more:

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of

society; and

"Whereas there is a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling; and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas large-scale gambling activity invariably attracts criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos into that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before.

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

This is signed by several hundred persons from my riding, and I have affixed my signature thereto.

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I have a petition here from Waterloo North Presbyterian Church, as well as All Saints Anglican Church, with whom they share their facilities. It comes from the minister, John Young. It says:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas credible academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I support my constituents in Waterloo, and I hereto sign my signature.

**Mr Paul Wessinger (Simcoe Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario from St George's Anglican Church in Barrie.

"Whereas the government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas credible academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the government has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** A petition to the members of the provincial Parliament, re Bill 38, an amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act to permit wide-open Sunday shopping and eliminate Sunday as a legal holiday:

"We, the undersigned, hereby request you to vote against the passing of Bill 38. We believe that this bill defies God's laws, violates the principles of religious freedom, reduces the quality of life, removes all legal protection to workers regarding when they must work, and will reduce, rather than improve the prosperity of our province. The observance of Sunday as a non-working day was not invented by man but dates from God's creation and is an absolute necessity for the wellbeing of all people, both physically and spiritually. We beg you to defeat the passing of Bill 38."

It's signed by myself and 71 residents of the Norfolk area of the province.

1500

#### BEER AND WINE TAX

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I have a petition which reads as follows:

"Mr Rae, get out of my pocket. I mow my own lawn, paint my own house and make my own beer. I don't want your proposed tax on brewing my own beer, which is my right. I support small businesses in my community and they in turn provide jobs. Stop patronizing big business lobbies at my expense. Mr Rae, stop the imposition of the tax on brew-your-own outlets."

This petition is signed by over 100 signatures, and I am happy to lend my support to it.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I have a petition here signed by approximately 1,800 people in my riding. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It says:

"We, the undersigned, request that Ridgetown and the surrounding district be recognized as an area of the province which has a shortage of family physicians. Specifically, we require exemption from the following aspects of the Ministry of Health expenditure control plan:

"The plan to withdraw older physicians from practice. This could result in a loss of three of the four doctors in our community who service over 10,000 people.

"The plan to reduce fees for new physicians by 75% for the first five years of practice. This will force the two doctors who are planning to start practising in our community in 1994 to leave the province.

"The plan to reduce payments to general practitioners who provide services above a certain threshold. This restriction would discourage the only physician who would be left in our community if the above aspects of the expenditure control plan are imposed on our community."

#### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** A petition to the Legislative Assembly:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"When discussing the future of Bruce A, to consider that the undersigned are in full support of the continued operation of all of the units at Bruce A. Furthermore, we support the expenditure of the required money to rehabilitate the Bruce A units for the following reasons:

"In comparison to other forms of generation, nuclear energy is environmentally safe and cost-effective. Rehabilitating Bruce A units is expected to achieve \$2 billion in savings to the corporation over the station's lifetime. This power is needed for the province's future prosperity.

"A partial or complete closure of Bruce A will have severe negative impacts on the affected workers and will seriously undermine the economy of the surrounding communities and the province."

I have attached my signature along with some 15,600 others. I can advise that we thought that this matter was progressing relatively well until we discovered that the New Democratic Party is now asking Ontario Hydro to find another \$100 million in its restructuring program, which I expect will negatively affect the Bruce A units. I continue this series of petitions.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's



expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction of the provision of quality health care services across the province;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"The government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

#### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have another petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas there is a concern in Bruce county and neighbouring communities that the Rae government will refuse to do rehabilitation and general maintenance work required to keep Bruce A functioning efficiently; and

"Whereas a detailed technical report prepared by informed and objective people has already shown that the maintenance and rehabilitation work is not only cost-effective but profit-generating; and

"Whereas there is concern in Bruce county and neighbouring areas that Bob Rae will circumvent that study by using non-objective people to restudy the cost-effectiveness of the rehabilitation and maintenance expenditures,

"Therefore, the undersigned request that the Legislature accept the list of signatures on the attached document addressed to Bob Rae and require the Premier to respond directly to them indicating that he will guarantee a fair assessment of Bruce A maintenance and rehabilitation plans."

This is signed by a citizen of Toronto, and I attach my signature in support. As I've said, these petitions are more necessary than ever since the NDP government is now forcing Ontario Hydro to find another \$100 million under the social contract when the workers and the employer have already been working very diligently to do some restructuring, to cut costs and meet a target which all want to achieve in terms of ratepayers' costs of Hydro.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### ELECTION STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE LES ÉLECTIONS

On motion by Mr Sorbara, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 57, An Act to amend the Election Act and the Legislative Assembly Act / Loi modifiant la Loi électorale et la Loi sur l'Assemblée législative.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you have any brief comments, Mr Sorbara?

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Yes, just very briefly. When this act passes, it will put to an end the century-old practice of allowing the Premier of the province to determine the timing of a by-election. When it passes, it will provide that 70 days after the death or resignation of a member, a by-election is to be held in the riding of that member.

#### CITY OF MISSISSAUGA ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Mahoney, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr46, An Act respecting the City of Mississauga.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### ONTARIO LOAN ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993

##### SUR LES EMPRUNTS DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Sutherland, on behalf of Mr Laughren, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 25, An Act to authorize borrowing on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund / Loi autorisant des emprunts garantis par le Trésor.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** The 1993 Ontario Loan Act will provide the government with authority to borrow up to \$16 billion over the 18-month period ending December 31, 1994. The amount of the Ontario Loan Act is calculated as the sum of the financing requirements for this fiscal year plus the financing requirements for the first nine months of the next fiscal year.

It is traditional to request authority to meet the borrowing needs for part of the following fiscal year to allow adequate time for the passage of subsequent loan acts, thus ensuring an orderly borrowing program. This year's borrowing program will include bonds, treasury bills, US commercial paper and medium-term notes.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Are there any questions and comments?

1510

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** How much did the province borrow last year, inasmuch as you're coming forward with this bill to give the province the right to borrow \$16 billion? How much did the government borrow last year and the year before? Just give us the years since Mr Rae and the NDP came to power.

It's so easy these days for people to come in with bills that are going to give the government the right to borrow, and \$16 billion is more money than the honourable member and I will make in our lifetimes, so I'd be interested in knowing just how much.

Maybe, as well, if you could answer the question,

how much interest we will end up paying on that \$16 billion before it's totally paid off. That is again a second question that every one of us should be thinking of. If you have a mortgage for \$100,000 over a 20-year period, you're going to end up paying well over \$200,000. So I'd be interested in knowing just how many billions of interest we will be paying on the money that you're bringing before this House.

We have to become all the more accountable, every one of us, on this kind of data, and as one who would like to speak on it further when we have an opportunity, the answer to those two questions would really please me: How much did we seek to borrow last year and the year before and how much interest is it we're going to be paying on this amount of money?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I recall, as we do regularly, having to do the Ontario Loan Act and go through various machinations trying to get information from the government with respect to its plans for the money. Each time that I've been here with the New Democratic Party, leading the charge on the budget, it has failed to meet its targets at almost every level.

I think I would, if I were able to move an amendment to this act, like to require the government to put out a line-by-line explanation of where each of the dollars that is being authorized to be borrowed under this act would be applied, and in fact, if it deviated one iota from that expenditure plan, that it would have to come back to this Parliament to get the approval of the people to the deviation from the expenditure plan.

I understand that for the government to accept an amendment from the opposition, on a budget bill in particular, would be tantamount to admitting a lack of confidence and in fact that would not very well fit in with our traditional way of doing business. I think the people of the province expect that we will have to borrow money just because of the nature of our business here, but it seems more and more my constituents would like some say or at least some review of all the dollars that are being borrowed and would like to put on what would be described in government circles as executive control, if I can describe it as that. But the executive control would reside on that borrowed money with the people, the taxpayers.

I understand that there is a budgetary plan and all that sort of stuff, but when you come in with the loan act, it would be so wonderful if you would say: "This \$100 million is to go to social services, this \$100 million to capital projects and we're going to stick to that. If there's a deviation, we can come back." Would you entertain that as a plan, Mr Parliamentary Assistant?

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The parliamentary assistant to the junior minister of Health, I suppose, is the one introducing this \$16-billion borrowing loan.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Finance.

**Mr Stockwell:** Finance, I'm sorry.

Yes, it's a significant amount of money. The insufficient information is truly mind-boggling when you talk about \$16 billion and it can be parcelled off on a two-page report.

The things that you should be supplying the public out there—some interesting facts that I think the public would like to know. For instance, you're acquiring \$16 billion in new dollars. How much debt are you retiring? That's a scary figure, I think. I think you should respond with that kind of number, because it seems to me the \$16 billion we're acquiring and what we're retiring are completely different figures. We're talking about retiring—I'm not sure how much—\$1 billion maybe, somewhere in that. Maybe you can check it out. We're retiring \$1 billion in debt and acquiring \$16 billion. That's got to raise some red flags around town.

When you look at the direct debt by current fiscal year-end, it's projected to be \$78.6 billion. Look at it this way, he just pops up to spend \$16 billion in new dollars. Think of it. Over the past decade Ontario's debt levels have increased by 161.7%. Imagine that, a 161.7% increase in debt in the last decade.

The per capita has increased by 126.3%. Now we just pop up and they're going to borrow another \$16 billion. It's frightening, the kind of money they're talking about here. All the while, the 161% increase in debt—per capita, personal income has gone up by 53.3%. So we have borrowed at three times the rate people's per capita incomes have gone up.

The real question I'd like to get out to the public out there is: You're borrowing \$16 billion new dollars. How much old debt are you retiring so you can acquire the \$16 billion? That, my friend, is a frightening statistic.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** I've listened to the three rebuttals now and all three of them had this grand opportunity to suggest an alternative. It's worth noting on the record that they failed to seize the moment and suggest that alternative.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Oxford, you have two minutes.

**Mr Sutherland:** In response to the question from the member for Markham, during the 1992-93 year, \$15 billion was borrowed. In response to the question from the member for Bruce, he wanted line by line, and the member for Bruce is well acquainted with the estimates process and the estimates give line-by-line awareness of where the money is planned on being spent.

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I suggest that we give extended time so the honourable parliamentary assistant can answer all the questions that have been asked.

**The Deputy Speaker:** That's not a point of order.



**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I only ask unanimous consent—he forgot to answer my question—to allow him to answer.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Unanimous consent? No. Further debate.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I'm pleased to begin the debate on what's called—

**Mr Cousens:** I'm surprised you're pleased.

**Mr Phillips:** I'm perhaps not pleased to be debating the issue, but I'm pleased to be debating some of the concerns that we have.

For all members, Bill 25 is the bill that authorizes the government to borrow \$16 billion, obviously an enormous amount of money. I wanted to spend some time on the bill because I think Canadians are becoming growingly aware of the problems of debt. I think, increasingly, by the way, that we as a country now are looking at our debt in total. One of the mistakes we've made in the past is that because we're a federal system—we've got a federal government that has debt and a provincial government that has debt—we haven't added the two together very carefully.

The international community, of course, now does that and is acutely aware of the debts of the provinces, and as a matter of fact, in many respects is focusing as much or more on provincial debt as it used to on federal debt. By not managing this issue, we're costing ourselves an awful lot of money.

Just as one small example of that, in addition to all the money we spend on the interest on the debt, the province of Ontario has recently lost its AAA credit rating. For many out there that may not seem all that important, but when you lose your AAA credit rating, for each time you lose, if you will, a mark on the rating, it costs about \$2.5 million a year in extra interest costs on every \$1 billion you borrow.

For all of us who are trying to find ways to economize, having lost our AAA rating, and we now are down to what's called essentially an AA rating—we could have been AA-plus, AA or AA-minus; we're about in the middle of AA—that is costing us, for each \$1 billion we borrow, around \$3 million a year in extra interest costs. You can see that the government plans to borrow \$16 billion here. With that one act alone, lost our AAA credit rating, the taxpayers of Ontario are going to be asked to pay almost \$50 million a year in extra interest costs just because we lost our AAA rating.

I many people in the province are now aware that this government, the Bob Rae government, is, I think, on the edge of losing the AA rating. That would be extremely significant because if we move from AA to A rating, not only do our interest costs go up, not only do people charge us more interest to loan us money, but we cut ourselves off from a whole range of sources of funds. There are many pension funds and many funds out there

that simply will not loan money to an organization that has less than a AA rating.

**1520**

While we'll get into many other areas on this bill, the government is teetering on the edge with our bond rating agencies. There are four major bond rating agencies. They all have Ontario under a microscope. That's why, in our opinion, Premier Rae had a major change of heart, almost, in March.

I remember, for example, that the Finance minister came to our finance and economics committee meeting in late February and said: "We've been working for months"—at least two months—"on this presentation. Here are all the numbers for the finance and economics committee." This was in something we call pre-budget hearings. "Here's what we think the deficit will be." It was around \$13.5 billion or \$14 billion. "Everything seems to be on track for what we thought was going to happen. We have to make some additional reductions in our expenditures."

That was in late February. Then a month later the Premier announced a completely different set of numbers. I think he went to the caucus and said: "The sky is falling. It's now going to be a \$17-billion deficit." Those who were on the finance and economics committee will remember it was only four weeks earlier that the Finance minister came and told us he'd done all the number tumbling and the deficit was going to be somewhere around \$14 billion.

The point I'm making is that nothing happened between the time the Finance minister came to our finance and economics committee and the time Premier Rae had the big announcement at the end of March, other than, I suspect, the rating agencies said to the government, "You're in trouble." We've been telling the government it's in trouble. The third party's been telling it it's in trouble. I think the rating agencies said, "You're in trouble." They didn't tell you what to do. They simply said, "Unless you do these things, you will lose your AA rating."

At least for someone outside looking at it, we began this exercise the Premier has been on now for the last four to five months of, I think, quite a disorganized process of trying to manage the province's finances. I happen to think the \$17-billion number came out of thin air. It couldn't go up by \$3 billion in four weeks. The Premier engages sometimes in being Premier and sometimes in being in collective bargaining. I think he got into the collective bargaining mode and said: "There's going to be a \$17-billion deficit. The sky is going to fall. The caucus better get in line, and then all the rest of the province had better get in line."

I believe that came as a result of the rating agencies telling the government that unless it got its financial house in order, we would be down from a AA rating to an A rating. That would be serious for a variety of

reasons. Increasingly, as I think most members of the House know, we borrow money outside Canada. I believe the two largest borrowings, bond issues, in the world, outside of sovereign borrowings, outside of countries borrowing, last year were done by Bob Rae's government. There was no other larger borrowing—two of them—than by Premier Rae.

Incidentally, the two lead groups that did them were both New York-based firms. Perhaps that had to be. I was, frankly, disappointed that they weren't led by Ontario-based firms for this reason: I happen to think that we have, to use the term, a world-class financial community in Ontario. That is one of our competitive edges. I'm a big believer, and I think most of us understand that if we're going to compete in the years ahead, we have to have "world-class" industries located here in Ontario that can compete with anyone around the world.

What did the government do? The two largest bond issues in the world last year were both done for the Ontario taxpayers, but the government chose two non-Ontario companies to lead those issues. They were very good companies; there's no doubt about that. They, by all accounts, did a very good job. I was somewhat disappointed to see that we weren't able to allow a couple of our Ontario-based firms to do that.

In any event, the bill that we're dealing with here is giving authorization to borrow another \$16 billion. As I said earlier, we are on the edge of the bond rating agencies taking our rating down, and if it goes down a little bit more, we have some significant problems.

Managing the debt: As I say, I think we now, all of us in Canada, are beginning to internalize and are beginning to understand why it's important, and are increasingly realizing that the debt isn't an abstract thing, that the debt isn't something that somebody else is going to pay, that the debt is something that we're going to pay.

Just so all of us understand, one way I look at debt is that there are, say, about five million people who work in the province of Ontario, and I don't mean that they have the only responsibility for the debt, but they tend to carry a larger share. If you were to divide the debt among those five million people, those five million people owe the federal government \$35,000 each in debt and they now owe the provincial government \$15,000 in provincial debt. That's \$50,000, and that's not abstract because, whether people out there have fully understood this or not, they have to pay about \$5,000 a year just to pay the interest on that.

We can see at the federal level, at the national level, what that's done. What we now find is that for every dollar of taxes we pay, 34 cents of it goes just to pay the interest on the federal debt. We have an enormous problem on our hands because we essentially are getting no services for that, but we're spending 34 cents of

every tax dollar.

It used to be, only four years ago in Ontario, that less than 10 cents of every dollar was spent paying the interest on our debt. It now, as I recall in the latest budget by the government, has gone to 16 cents. In 1990-91, 8.8 cents of every dollar we paid in taxes went to pay the interest on the debt. It has literally doubled in the last four years, to 16 cents.

By all accounts, we can see now that the Bob Rae government has doubled the debt in three years. When he came into power, the debt in this province, after 122 or 123 years, was at about \$40 billion. We now see that at the end of this year, the debt in the province will have gone to \$78 billion, if I'm not mistaken. That's right: \$78.6 billion, virtually doubled after three NDP budgets, and the amount of money we now have to spend just to pay the interest on it has gone, as I said before, from about nine cents of every dollar we raise to 16 cents, and we're teetering on it getting out of control. That's why the bond-rating agencies have increasingly focused on Canada and, taking into account aggregating, adding the two together, indicated that, "Unless Ontario gets its financial house in order, you're going to lose the rating."

1530

So the bill we're debating today, while it's only really one page, is important, because it allows the people of Ontario to understand and focus on the debt/deficit problem that the Bob Rae government has gotten us into.

How did we get here? How did we arrive at this problem? I think people out there are astute enough and smart enough to understand that you can't blame one individual or one government or one circumstance for all of the problems we're in. There is no one reason.

For all of us who understand and watch global events, we see other countries. Europe's struggling right now in many respects, Japan's gone through a bit of a tough patch, and I'm sorry to see that the gross domestic product in the US looks like it's slowed down a little bit in the past few weeks, which incidentally is a problem for us, because as we all know, the Ontario economy depends heavily on a successful US economy and if that slows down we're in trouble; 85% of our exports go to the US. I think everyone right now believes that the reason the Ontario economy is ticking along and showing some modest growth is because of exports. All of our home consumption is very weak.

In any event, how did we get where we are now? World events have contributed to it; there's no doubt about that. The free trade agreement: It's always interesting here in the Legislature, for those people who watch it, that if someone asks Premier Rae why the economy isn't going any better, it's, "The free trade agreement's really devastated us."



I think it is fair to say that if there were a way to implement the free trade agreement poorly, Canada found the way to do that. Whether you agree or disagree with the free trade agreement, I don't think there's any doubt that it has been badly implemented, and to whatever extent we could have taken real economic advantage of it, we handcuffed our manufacturing sector during its introduction.

If you remember, I believe when the free trade agreement was just being introduced the Canadian dollar was at 76 or 77 cents and then went up to 88 cents. That's like taking the price of goods up for our manufacturing sector by 12% or 13%. Just when they're trying to move into the US and compete, the Canadian dollar goes up that much and we handcuff ourselves. That also was the time when interest rates went up very substantially, and went up substantially vis-à-vis the US, and we put another handcuff on our manufacturing sector, plus we'd been through a period of some political instability.

So regardless of one's view on the free trade agreement, I think there is general agreement that the way it was implemented was bad.

I also happen to think that something we haven't as a Legislature really looked at thoroughly enough, and I think it will become increasingly clearer, is that the underground economy, if I can use that term, the non-traditional economy, is far larger now than it was a few years ago and may grow even more. Examples of that we've all got, but the smuggling that goes on in the tobacco and liquor business is substantial.

When I talk about the Rae government doubling the debt and getting us into a very serious fiscal problem, I wanted to point out the other things that really it had relatively little to do with. At the same time, I think it's important to point some things out.

When Bob Rae took over as Premier, Ontario had just had its first balanced budget in 20 years. That's not widely known. It's something the Conservatives don't like us to remind people of; they get angry when we tell people that the Conservatives, for the last 15 years they were in, never balanced the budget and always ran substantial deficits. I know they'd like to portray Premier Davis and the Treasurer then, Mr McKeough, as the great financial managers. The fact is that for the final 15 years of Conservative government here in Ontario, ending in 1985, there were 15 straight years of deficits.

Because one can get into partisan interpretations of this. I think the people of Ontario really need to simply look at the Provincial Auditor's report. The Provincial Auditor, for anyone who doesn't know, is an independent body that looks at the province's finances and gives the people of Ontario an independent view on the finances of the province. They examine the books and ensure that the government of the day is properly

keeping the books and properly reporting them. It's a very worthwhile function.

The Provincial Auditor did two things, among others, in his 1991 report. This was the report that was prepared after the Rae government came in and reported on what we call the 1990-91 fiscal year. What the Provincial Auditor said was, "Ontario has had only one surplus in the last 20 years." That was the year ended March 31, 1990. If you remember, as I well remember, the Liberal government was defeated in September 1990, so a surplus, documented by the Provincial Auditor, as of March 31, 1990.

I notice the Minister of Natural Resources looking incredulous. I'm not sure that their caucus or their cabinet perhaps is aware of all these things: One surplus in 20 years, the year ended March 31, 1990. Then the Rae government came in, about five months later, at the beginning of September. As I say, there was a surplus when the Rae government came in.

I have to acknowledge that the budget that was prepared and presented in April 1990 by Bob Nixon, Treasurer Nixon, called for another surplus. That 1990-91 budget said there would be a second consecutive surplus. That's the one that ended up with the \$3-billion deficit. I know the Premier loves to trot that one out: "You were going to have a surplus and you ended up with a deficit. You misled the people." That's the implication of it.

I want to say a few things about that, because it's important to make sure the record is clear. Again, the Provincial Auditor looked at that. How could it be that we had a surplus one year, that Treasurer Nixon predicted a surplus, and then at the end of the year, it ended up in a \$3-billion deficit? Hadn't the Liberals misled the public? Here's what the Provincial Auditor said about how it went from a surplus to a \$3-billion deficit.

He said, "The major factors contributing to this variance were"—he's talking about the fact that a surplus was predicted, then the deficit ended up being \$3 billion—"the extent of the recession, which was obviously not foreseen at the time of the budget," and I think it's understandable that it wasn't foreseen. "Total revenues were down by approximately \$1.1 billion due primarily to the influence of the recession on taxation revenues." That's about 2% of the revenue. The Provincial Auditor said that when the budget was prepared, the extent of the recession was not foreseen, so it's not unusual to see a revenue drop of that magnitude.

1540

Secondly, "Expenditures were up by approximately \$1 billion, with the increase in social assistance payments the major contributing factor." Again, I think a fairminded person would say, "When you get into that sort of recession for that length of time, it's not unusual that social assistance costs go up," and they did.

The third reason for the \$3-billion deficit was that the Bob Rae government chose to make three special payments totalling \$924 million. One was to the Ontario teachers' pension fund. That payment was not due until the following year, but the government chose to move \$196 million of teacher pension spending up one year, advance the payment. They paid off a \$400-million loan to the Urban Transportation Development Corp that was not due, and they wrote off SkyDome, \$321 million.

These are good political moves, because it's a good way to say: "We inherited a mess from the Liberals. They said there'd be a surplus, but it's a \$3-billion deficit. Woe is me." As I say, it's natural politics.

As a matter of fact, I kept the reports from then Treasurer Laughren, now Minister of Finance, who said publicly, after he'd been in the job for several weeks, that nobody attempted to mislead. He said, "Nixon was simply giving the best estimates of the treasury staff at the time." I point that out, because when we get into a debate about how we got into this, I'm sometimes slightly amused, I guess.

Bob Rae will say, "You left an awful mess for me," but I don't know how you can justify saying "an awful mess," when a balanced budget was certified and presented. The Provincial Auditor acknowledged it, said it was a surplus. All of your own numbers showed a surplus five months before you took over office. How can the sky suddenly fall?

The NDP says, "You people were spendthrifts" and all that sort of thing. Well, here's what Bob Rae's New Democratic Party said when we were preparing that budget. This was when they were still in opposition, when they were demanding more spending and saying, "Spend more, spend more." What was Bob Rae saying in the spring of 1990, before the election? Now he says that we were the spend party, but then he was saying of the then Liberal government:

"The Ontario government has reacted to predictions of an economic slowdown by dropping its liberal pretence, and it's showing its true conservative nature. The Liberal government is now spreading the message that 1990 will be a year of fiscal financial restraint. The Liberal majority on the finance committee agrees with this conservative philosophy and has recommended a course of restraint.

"The New Democratic Party challenges this defence of the status quo by calling on the government to implement the reform policies needed to bring fairness to our society."

So when members of the NDP government say, "Well, no one warned us that things might be getting bad," and that the Liberals wanted to keep spending, I don't believe it, because the Bob Rae NDP caucus said: "The Liberals are predicting an economic slowdown. The Liberals are saying we need a program of restraint.

The Liberals are telling us that we've got to watch our spending. But they're wrong." That's what Bob Rae said before the election. Now in the House you'll often hear him say, "The Liberals wanted to spend and we want to save." Not the case.

Again, Bob Rae says, "I was left with an awful mess." The unemployment rate in the province of Ontario was the lowest of any province in the country by far when Bob Rae took over. It was around 6%. Now, as we know from the budget, the unemployment rate—and again I point out the chart in the budget that disturbs me the most, where Bob Rae says, "If these discouraged workers were counted as unemployed, Ontario's current unemployment rate would be about 14%." So we've gone from the lowest unemployment rate in the country to where we have an almost unheard of 14% unemployment rate in real terms.

We now find Manitoba has a substantially lower rate of unemployment than we do, as does Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia. There's even been a period within the last year or so when New Brunswick had a lower unemployment rate than Ontario, and I'm very happy for New Brunswick on that, very happy, but for Ontario I'm very sad.

So the reason I go through this is to try and put it into some perspective when Premier Rae says, "Woe is me," and, "I was left with a terrible problem." Well, he was left with the lowest unemployment rate in the country. We now find four provinces with substantially better unemployment rates. So you can't say it's all just a global problem.

We had just had the first surplus in 20 years in the province. That's not to say that there aren't challenges, major challenges presented by a slowdown in the economy, but there was the first surplus in 20 years, the only surplus in 20 years. Premier Rae is often fond of saying, "Well, no one warned me." Well, lots of people warned him; he just wasn't listening.

So what was the biggest problem, what single thing led us to this situation, our fiscal situation? I said earlier that you cannot blame Bob Rae for everything, but I would say there is no doubt that the first NDP budget was a huge mistake. None of the NDP members can ever admit that publicly. I recall the words in it: "We could fight the deficit or we could fight the recession. We're going to fight the recession." A big mistake, huge mistake, and you're paying for it now. The fact is that you should have fought both things. There was not—well, the member might laugh, but you're going to have to learn to do more than one thing at once.

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** How? Gerry, how?

**Mr Phillips:** You say, "How?" It's very simple. If you understood where this is going to lead, you don't take your spending up 14%, you don't offer settlements



that are three and four times the rate of inflation.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** That isn't true.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, it is true.

**Mr Owens:** Blame the victim.

**Mr Phillips:** The members are choosing to heckle, but the thought of continuing to defend that budget is disturbing. I think the most you could do is just hang your head and try and forget you made that big mistake, and it was a big mistake. Now, I tell you, everybody is paying for it because you're clawing it back. You opened the tap and you left it running for two years. I guarantee you any objective analysis of that budget would show it was a huge mistake. I wouldn't defend it. The best you can say is, "I'm sorry, we didn't know at the time it was a mistake." But now the members are wanting to defend the budget; it's indefensible. It was a mistake, huge mistake.

1550

Actually, I can remember, and Hansard will show this, because we, the finance and economics committee, spent that summer, the summer of 1991, touring the province, getting feedback on the budget—I learned several things at that session. One is, I can recall the Premier's office phoning groups to get out and defend the budget. I thought it was an indefensible budget. I can remember saying to various groups: "Well, suppose the government's wrong. Suppose this is going to slow the economy down, and suppose that rather than spending one's way out of the recession, that's not the right approach, and we should have had some restraint in it. What will you say then?"

I think the critics of that budget—and, by the way, they were the third party, ourselves; I don't think there was another jurisdiction in North America that thought Bob Rae was right on this. The word "restraint" never appeared in that budget; never appeared in it. It was a huge mistake. I don't think there's any doubt about that. Once you run two years of \$11-billion and \$12-billion deficits, once you get that built in, boy, it's tough to get it out, as you're finding now, as we're finding now. As I say, it's all got to be extracted, and that's far more difficult than giving.

If there is one thing that I will hold the government accountable for, it will be that one, because the price we'll pay for it has been and will be enormous, not the least of which is—I'd like to talk about where we are now and how we go on from here, but the exercise we're involved in now on what's called the social contract is chaotic. It is totally chaotic.

I have a feeling for what the caucus is going through because it is fundamental change being made up, unfortunately, on the back of an envelope because of the time. The time pressures have simply run ahead of the government's ability to stay apace with it. I fault

Premier Rae on that. When you're going to work your way out of these problems, you need a plan and you need to bring people along. I think we're in the middle of a totally chaotic process and, God—gosh; pardon my language, Mr Speaker—I hope that we can work our way through it because we're on the edge of being seen as fiscal incompetents by the world financial community, and we're now in that ball game of the world financial community, whether we like it or not. As soon as you decide that you're going to have to borrow those amounts of money, as soon as you decide you're going to float those issues, as they say, globally, and as soon as you hire the high-profile houses, as they say, to do it, you're on the international scene, and they are scratching their heads.

Frankly, for all of us, it puts a lot of responsibility on us. I have major problems with the social contract. I think it's a strange piece of work. The thing I worry about is what implications it will have on, as I say, the global financial community.

So how did we get here? That's the point I was trying to make. I will repeat: No one can blame Bob Rae for all of the problems of this province. It has no credibility, that sort of statement. I do believe that he has made some fundamental mistakes. I think the biggest fundamental mistake was that first budget they presented where: "We have a choice. We could fight the deficit; we could fight the recession. We're only going to fight one thing." As I said earlier, you've got to be able to do more than one thing at once around here, and now we're all paying for that.

That wasn't the only thing. I think that Bill 40—and I would speculate that may be, for the government, one of the proudest accomplishments. It used to be Premier Rae said OTAB was his proudest accomplishment. I happen to think OTAB's going to be a big problem. I've made my view known on that, our views known on that. I don't think you'll be bragging about that in two or three years.

But what's called Bill 40—and I realize we use the jargon around here. Perhaps no one else understands what Bill 40 is. It's major amendments to the Ontario Labour Relations Act. It's the rules that govern collective bargaining between employee and employers. That one became, I think, a symbol for the NDP government, I guess, but I think it cost significantly in the job-creating area.

The mismanagement of the finances: It's bad enough to present the budget, but then I happen to have a view that last year's budget—which, if you remember, was the second NDP budget. It came, it was announced, with a \$9.9-billion deficit. I said the day that came out, "It will not be \$9.9 billion; it will be \$12 billion." I said, "I don't know; I think Premier Rae instructed that the deficit had to be under \$10 billion." But there were many things in that budget that did not have a hope of

coming true.

I'll give you one example, by the way, because we've raised this issue on pensions before, and I would at least ask the NDP back bench to watch this one, because an integral part of the social contract is, as I read it, a three-year holiday from making payments into the teachers' pension portion to make up part of the unfunded liability.

In last year's budget the government had what they called "Rescheduling of Cash Payments." What it was, was that the government owed the teachers' pension and the public service pension \$564 million that was due January 1, 1992. But the government rescheduled the cash payment to April 1, 1992—I'm sorry, 1993; excuse me, rescheduled it from January 1, 1993, to April 1, 1993. Now, that was an expense that was due last fiscal year but the stroke of a pen moved it into this fiscal year, delayed paying, and the reason was to report a deficit below \$10 billion.

The thing that I objected most strenuously to was that the taxpayers had to pay 11.25% interest on that, way above what they could borrow on the market. It cost the taxpayers of Ontario \$50,000 a day for that one single move, and that's well documented. There is no question about that. We, all of you out there, paid \$50,000 a day in interest penalties, in higher interest rates on that pension just so Bob Rae could report a deficit below \$10 billion. I thought it was obscene; I really did.

I do not fault the teachers' pension. I think it was a business deal for them. They said, "Well, you owe us all of that money"—it was \$500 million that was owed to the teachers' pension on January 1—"we'll agree to delay it for three months, but you have to pay us 11.25% interest on it," because that was part of the contractual deal.

**1600**

I don't blame the teachers. They were acting in the best interests of what's called the fiduciary responsibility of the people they work for to manage their pension fund. But the government and the people of Ontario paid \$50,000 a day for nothing other than that cosmetic delay, and that's when you really can get angry—that's when the public can really get angry. The opposition can get angry too, but I think the public gets extremely angry when they see not only games played with the numbers but enormous penalties paid as a result of that.

The reason I raise that is because if you start playing games once with pensions, I get suspicious. I will be watching carefully in the social contract negotiations. What's going to happen there is \$500 million a year for three years, each year, is going to be delayed and not paid, and I'm afraid that, rather than it being simply a legitimate real saving, what we've done is we've simply put off to a future government a liability that was due now. The reason I raise that is that in addition to the budget numbers, there were what I perceived to be

games played.

There was another one where the government said, "We are going to get \$1.2 billion in fiscal stabilization money." Well, no one I know believed that. It never happens. This was an arrangement between the federal government and the provincial governments, and it never happens that you get paid on the schedule the government put in there. If you can prove it, you get paid over a long period of time, and we said that the day it was announced. We said, "Listen, you'll be lucky to get a fraction of that \$1.2 billion."

The reason I'm going through all of this is that the public is astute, and it cost the government an awful lot in credibility when they played those games a year ago with the budget.

I guess another thing that's compounded the problems is, I happen to believe that our biggest challenge in the province, above all else—and I don't mean to diminish and undermine the fiscal situation—will be, how are we going to create an environment where enough jobs are created that we have for the people of Ontario a sense of purpose and a sense of optimism and a sense of future?

As I say, the most disturbing number in the budget was the 14% unemployment rate. That chart shows that the unemployment rate never gets below 12%, and that is a situation that we've never faced before in this province, where for a long period of time we're going to have a whole group of people who want to work, who are trained, who have skills and nowhere to go.

I know that Premier Rae has always said, "Jobs are our number one priority," and then somehow or other something else becomes the number one priority. The constitutional issue was clearly his number one priority for a period of time, and I understand that. As a matter of fact, I think he's fairly talented in that area. It's an area that he rather likes.

He really enjoys the national news and really enjoys talking to the national reporters and hurrying in and out of these major meetings with premiers. I must say maybe he's changed a little bit, because he seems to be not anxious to go to one now, but he always was off to the ones in the past, and that took a lot of his energy and time, and understandably.

Now his time is being spent on this fiscal situation—in fact the energies of the province. I dare say the government is traumatized by it right now. I don't see anything else going on over there than the fiscal situation and the sleepless nights that must be going on and all the chaos that's going on.

So how did we get here? As I said before, one can't blame Premier Rae for everything, but I don't think there's much doubt that there have been some very major mistakes made by this government, the major one being the series of budgets that were brought in that



have literally doubled the debt, have got us in a position now where this year much of our increased revenue is going just to pay the increased interest on the debt. So that first budget, the second budget and the third budget are major mistakes.

We now are coming up to three years of an NDP government. Something else I always carry around with me—having said that, I hope I can find it now. We're almost at three years from the last election. David Peterson was a good friend of mine. I went to high school with Premier Peterson. I had a lot of respect for him. I felt, feel and continue feeling he was a first-rate individual.

The thing in the last election that caught my attention was here in the Legislature when Premier Rae launched his campaign, "'The Premier has lied to the people,' Rae charges." This was Bob Rae talking about David Peterson. Actually, I've never forgiven Premier Rae for that. I suppose you can call me bitter for that, I don't know.

"Lying" is a strong word, and I will say that Premier Rae went down in my eyes that day when he did that. It might have been good politics, but it was a signal to me that maybe he wasn't all he was cut out to be. But he said: "Premier Peterson has lied directly to the people with respect to car insurance. So I don't see that I have any alternative to say that in the last election Mr Peterson lied to people of the province about car insurance, about taxes and about free trade."

Then we see the government changing virtually everything that it ran on, virtually everything. So I have lost a good deal of respect for the ability of the government to command the respect of the people.

Where do we go from here? The government is looking for our agreement to borrow \$16 billion, and we have a substantial problem on our hands here. The budget that has been presented doesn't, in my opinion, hold out hope or optimism. It is a budget that I think is devoid of any optimism. I read this thing a fair bit and it doesn't offer any sense of hope and optimism.

As a matter of fact, not only does it not offer optimism; it assumes that the unemployment rate is going to stay, in 1996, at 12%. I say it assumes that. The government knows its plans, the government knows all the things it's going to do to try and correct these things, but even taking all of those things into account, the unemployment rate still remains at 12%.

There are still some major questions that we have about the numbers in the budget. I'll give you a few examples. In this budget, there's something called moving capital to loan-based financing. There it is on page 83. I think many people in the public think, "Boy, that sounds good." It says somewhere in here that they're going to move from a grant-based to a loan-based method of financing.

1610

Let me tell you what that is. The province historically has provided to schools, to hospitals, to universities, to colleges about \$600 million a year in capital grants. That's generally regarded as the amount of money that the province should be spending on assisting to build the capital on all those things: every year, \$600 million a year.

Now the government says it's going to keep spending the \$600 million, but it's going to do it quite differently. They're going to make the school boards, which are being hit quite hard, the hospitals, the colleges, the universities go out and borrow that money for the government. I'm not sure whether all the NDP backbenchers are aware of this. Then they say, "But don't you worry, you go borrow the money for us, and we'll agree to repay it over 20 years."

What we're doing here is we are moving an enormous amount of money, spending, off the government books and on to school boards, colleges, universities and hospitals. But there's only one person who has the obligation to repay that and that's the provincial government. So it's a cute trick. What it means is, the government can say, "We're still spending \$600 million a year on the capital," but some future government's going to have to repay that over 20 years.

The reason I raise that is because this bill calls for borrowing \$16 billion. I have a feeling that part of that money may go into the Ontario financing corporation and may end up being the money that the school boards have to borrow on behalf of the province. So that's one little concern we have in the budget.

The second concern is that there's something called savings from deferred savings. The government talks about what a great expenditure control program it has. You should be aware that of the \$2.4-billion expenditure control program, \$540 million is simply savings from deferred savings. They are simply postponing expenses to next year, and that's not me saying that, that's the government document that says \$540 million are savings simply by delaying the expenditure.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** You are not in your chair.

**Mr Harnick:** There is not a quorum present, I believe.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please check if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

**Mr Phillips:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was talking

about some of our concerns about the way the government once again is reporting its finances, and pointing out that the public is able to deal with tough news. The public understands these things, but if you hide the numbers from them, it takes them a lot longer to understand the magnitude of the problem. So I wanted to point out, expenditure savings, \$540 million, are simply delaying expenditures that should have been made this year to next year. They're going to have to make them, but they're just delaying them, the new way that school capital is going to be raised.

I'll tell you the implications of this, Mr Speaker. We are going to pile up new debt every year of about \$600 million, not on the government books, but they'll be spread on all school boards around the province. It will show up as a loan payable, but they'll say: "Well, don't worry about it because we've got the signature of the provincial government. They're going to pay this thing off." All we've done is hide \$600 million a year in spending.

Remember, I mentioned earlier in this discussion that last year the government, with the teachers' pensions and the public service pensions, did that little rescheduling of cash payments, where it moved \$500 million of teachers' pension money that should have been paid January 1, moved it one fiscal year. The plan is to do that once again. They're going to delay it once again and put that \$500 million into next fiscal year.

**Mr Harnick:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We still don't have a quorum.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please verify if there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mr Phillips:** The reason I'm raising this is because somebody is going to have to pay these bills and the government is choosing to hide many of these things. The pension one I wanted to mention again, because particularly with the discussions going on on social contracts, we're going to be watching very carefully what's happening with the pension funds.

There also is a plan to set up a reality capital corporation. This is going to be very interesting. We're looking forward to the discussion at committee on this bill, because here's what's happening: The government already has sold \$600 million worth of land to itself. The government has, with the stroke of a pen, taken \$600 million worth of Ontario publicly owned land, moved it over to something called the Ontario Realty Corp, which is a crown agency of the government, and then shown \$600 million worth of revenue on the government side.

It's a paper transaction designed to show revenues

going up by simply selling some assets to ourselves, \$600 million worth of land transferred over to the Ontario Realty Corp.

What's going to start to happen now is that the government will also sell its government buildings to itself. You're going to see government-owned buildings, fully paid off—they're all paid off—where our public service is working, that we're going to sell to ourselves so we'll show a bunch of revenue coming in. Then we're going to lease them back.

In the private sector, if a company tried to show it as revenue and said, "Listen, our revenue isn't as bad as we thought because we've sold ourselves a bunch of buildings," I don't think an accountant would sign the books.

There's nothing wrong legally with what they're doing, I'm not suggesting that, but here's exactly what happens: We show all this revenue coming in because we sold the government building. Isn't that wonderful? But then we lease it back. It would be the same as saying to ourselves: "I'm in trouble financially, I can't afford the groceries, but I've got my house all paid off. I think I will completely remortgage my house so I can pay for my groceries and then take on a brand new mortgage payment every month." We are simply delaying dealing with these tough financial issues.

1620

There are plans to set up two other capital corporations, one on roads and one on sewers and water, and we see some merit in them. Obviously, we have some issues around them and we'll want answers to some questions, but at least they have some merit, in our minds. But this moving to "loan-based" financing on school capital is not loan-based at all. It is, "You go borrow the money for me and I'll sign the note and repay it, but I don't want anybody to find out that I owe you the money." It is a mistake to do that.

I want to talk a little bit about the revenue side of things because we're now less than 48 hours away from when everybody in the province will see their personal income tax go up dramatically. For those of you out there who may not be aware of this, your provincial income tax is going to go up 11% on July 1. The reason for that is this: The government is anxious to get a full year of tax revenue from you, but it wants to do it all in six months, so it has essentially doubled the hit for the last six months of the year. That's exactly what they've done. As of July 1, everybody out there, when they get their paycheque, will see, "Holy gosh, my provincial income tax has gone up 11%—dramatically."

Here's the problem, in our opinion. We talked about this earlier today. In the budget Bob Rae said, "The recession has ended and the Ontario economy has turned the corner." That's the basis on which the budget was put together. It was on the assumption that the recession is over, that the Ontario economy has turned the corner.



I ask every business person I run into: "How are things going? Have you seen the economy turn?" I have not found one who says he's seen it turn. Maybe you have. I'd love the name. I always ask it in a way that doesn't lead the answer. I say, "Are you seeing the economy turn up?" Not one. I learned to do this a long while ago because at our finance and economics committee, we had economists come in. Two years ago, they were predicting the recession was over and things were going to be fine; that was not what I was hearing from business people out there.

Anyway, the government, Bob Rae, has said, "The recession has ended and the Ontario economy has turned the corner." I don't see that for the reasons we've talked about. The unemployment rate continues to be very troubling. As a matter of fact, in the budget—this was interesting, if I can find it now; I will find it, I think—the government said that 98,000 jobs have been created in Ontario in the past eight months. It was just this last Thursday that the Treasurer came before our finance and economics committee, and that report, which I can't find right now, says not 98,000 jobs, but I think 80,000 jobs have been created in the last nine months. The point I'm making is that the budget was based on the economy recovering. The recession was over. We're on our way.

In less than 48 hours we're going to give the economy another shock. So we're into a debate. We had a chance last week to talk to the Minister of Finance. I think most people appreciate that it's not a particularly easy job and that he has to make these judgements of what is the right balance. But I would say there is a very significant risk that the combination of the tax increases and the other sales tax increases in the budget will stop our economic recovery in its tracks, if there is an economic recovery going on out there, and it is very, very fragile.

The government has made its decision. There are those of us over here who would argue that it was wrong. I would just say that if it does stop the economic recovery in its tracks, for every 1% of the gross domestic product that we lose, it costs the province about \$500 million in tax revenue. There's an old rule of thumb around here that says, "For every 1% of gross domestic product, revenues grow by roughly 1%." If the tax increases do have a significant negative impact on the economy, not only will it cost us jobs but it will cost us revenue.

The third thing on the current situation is the social contract, as we say, and it's quite amazing, in a period of about four months, how this jargon, if you will, has crept into our vocabulary. But we now are, I guess, five weeks away from when 9,000 collective agreements have to be reached in the province. We are seeing, I think, real chaos out there.

Others say, "Well, what would you do?" Just in case

some of you may be listening, I will repeat what we said we would do 10 weeks ago. What should have happened, without any doubt, is that the government should have said to each of the partners: "We simply have to have a 5% reduction. We will allow the two parties to negotiate that agreement with themselves. Thirdly, we will sit down with our own union, OPSEU, and work out a model agreement, one that we would hope could be useful for the parties."

Now we've got a mishmash of things that won't work. We've got sectoral agreements impacting on local agreements. One of the most amazing things to me is why any government would agree to legislation that allows a minister to have the final decision on collective agreements. It isn't just till August 1; it's for the next three years that a cabinet minister will have the opportunity—

**Mr Harnick:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe we have a quorum present.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please check if there is quorum.

**Acting Table Clerk (Mr Franco Carrozza):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is present.

**Mr Phillips:** I was talking about the current situation and where we go from here. As I said before, what really should have happened, and what still should happen, is a simple one-page bill. What's happened is that I gather collective bargaining went on, got to a stage, and now the government's trying to incorporate in legislation where the negotiations got to. That's a very dangerous thing, that we're trying to put into legislation the elements that should go into a free collective agreement. And we're going to find these sectoral agreements will have very profound impact on local negotiations: There will be certain things in those sectoral agreements that make no sense whatsoever for a local agreement, but they'll end up in local agreements.

1630

As I say, one of the more troubling things to me is why we would ever put ourselves in a position where we give the final authority to a cabinet minister to approve or disapprove collective agreements. Surely we're starting to tread on some very dangerous ground when the final approval of a collective agreement rests on getting some political body's approval. Perhaps, as I gather it is Minister of Finance Laughren who will have that authority, people may feel comfortable, but ministers come and go. We are now setting the precedent where the provincial government is going to take it on itself to know all, to see all and to do all, and to put its stamp of approval on every single collective agreement, the 9,000 collective agreements in the province.

What I also wanted to talk a little bit about was the unemployment situation. We're just coming up on the first six months of the year, and we've seen that our manufacturing sector continues to see fewer jobs. When we look ahead at how we are going to deal with this unemployment situation, historically we'd hoped the manufacturing sector could help to deal with it, but even from 1985 to 1990, when the manufacturing sector was doing very well, growing very nicely and output going up substantially, the number of jobs in manufacturing still dropped significantly. So it will not be in manufacturing where we will see the jobs created.

It will not be—and that's about 20% of the jobs—construction, which continues to struggle in a very significant way. I have many of the construction trades in talking to me on a regular basis, and they've been praying that we would begin to see an upturn in the economy. But as we all know, the ICI, the industrial, commercial and institutional sector, is dead, and it would appear that for a considerable period of time we're going to see very little construction in that sector. In the housing sector I hope we'll begin to see an upturn, but significant jobs will not be created in the construction area, and that's a significant number of the jobs in Ontario.

It will not be in trade. Trade is our retail-wholesale sector.

It won't be in public administration; as we know, we're in a period where we're going to see fewer, not more, jobs in public administration.

We often think it's going to be in the service sector, and about a third of the jobs in the province are in the service sector. But we should be aware that half the service sector jobs are in education and health; in education, in all the elementary, secondary, colleges, universities and all the various training sectors, and in health, in all the health and welfare areas. Half the service sector jobs are there, and that's not going to grow very much.

Frankly, it's easier to define the problem than the solutions, obviously, and I think we increasingly understand the problem. Where will the solutions rest? Well, fundamentally we need to instil a sense of confidence in this province. My sense out there right now is that people are apprehensive about the future and have very little confidence in the Rae government, and as long as that goes on, we're not going to see investment in this province, job-creation investment.

When I look at investment, it isn't just financial investment. In fact, probably a more important investment than financial investment is intellectual investment. This is where I think you'll see that historically jobs have been created and not created. That's where individuals have an idea and get excited about it and decide they are going to try and conquer the world with it. They get out developing it and then they hire a few

people and away they go. Inevitably, almost without exception, that's a tough road, because you've got a whole bunch of hurdles to get over. But we've created a climate in the province where people have lost their confidence in wanting to do that.

So it isn't just attracting the capital investment, although that's extremely important and, for the manufacturing sector, it's paramount; if they don't invest in technology, we're finished, because there's no doubt we're now into an era where we are going to have to compete globally whether we like it or not, no question of that.

But we need that sense of confidence, we need a sense of confidence by people. There is no doubt that we need a consumer-led recovery. You hear that jargon all the time, but it's true. What we've got now is an export-led attempt at a recovery. It can't do it on its own. Our exports seem to be growing very nicely, but it will not get the economy going. That's where I go back to the point I made earlier, that the tax increases coming July 1 will significantly dampen that consumer-led recovery.

The second thing we need is that there's no doubt we need to get the fiscal house in order. Someone asked aid the other day, "How long will this debate about the debt/deficit go on?" I think that debate is over. I think there is consensus in the country that it has to be tackled. Now it's a question of how it's tackled, not whether it should be tackled. That wasn't the case, by the way, even two or three years ago.

As a matter of fact, at the end of every year I send out a questionnaire to my constituents just to get their views. It's interesting just how much it's changed in two years. I realize that the people who respond may not be typical of the constituency. Essentially, a year ago the number one issue was economic conditions; 24% of the people felt that way. The number two issue was national unity, the second most important thing; 22% of the people. Then taxes, 19% of the people, and unemployment 13%.

This year, the economic issue has gone from 24% ranking and number one to 51%. National unity was 22% a year ago and it's 3% this year; someone indicated perhaps a smaller number than that. It actually went from being close to the number one issue to being close to—I had 10 issues here—being the 10th most important issue. The economic issues, the economy, taxes and jobs, have all gone right up the scale. It was interesting and it's informative to me, at least, to have that.

The point I'm making is this: The debate about whether we need to manage the debt/deficit is over. Now I think that issue has been joined nationally, and I might say perhaps none too soon. There are many people who look at this, but the Business Council on National Issues, a very reputable group of people and



companies involved in it, put together this chart showing government debt. What they've done is to aggregate the provincial and the federal debt, which is the way we must look at it, because many of the countries—for example, I think we've sometimes looked at the United States and said, "The US federal debt is about 10 times what our federal debt is, so vis-à-vis the US, we're about the same." But essentially, the states do not run deficits or debts—essentially; they do have some hidden numbers. But here, as you know, we run substantial provincial debts.

1640

The point I'm making is that Canada now is ranked, in terms of government debt to GDP, what debt we have as a percentage of our gross domestic product—and you can see that this is Canada way over here at 91%. We have debt equivalent to 91% of our GDP. The only countries behind us are Ireland, Italy and Belgium. Then you can see over here Sweden, Japan, Finland, Australia, Germany, France, UK, Spain, US, Greece, all well below us. The point I'm making is that the issue has now, as I say, been joined even by Bob Rae.

I mentioned the difference between federal debt and provincial debt. It is the provincial debt that has been growing most dramatically. We now see that the combined provincial debts are about \$205 billion. The federal debt is about \$490 billion. The total debt is \$696 billion. The reason I raise all of that is just to point out that in Canada we must look at the combination of it. Increasingly, I think all of us recognize that there's only one taxpayer. There isn't a federal taxpayer and a provincial taxpayer and a municipal taxpayer. We have only one taxpayer.

So where do we go from here, getting the fiscal house in order, getting a sense of confidence in the economy and a sense of confidence in the consumer, in the public? The bill that we have before us calls for the government to borrow another \$16 billion. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, we're right on the edge of some real worries in the international financial markets about the state of the province's finances, both in terms of the numbers but also in terms of the government's ability to manage them. As I said before, I think the province lost an awful lot of credibility over the last two years by both the numbers and, perhaps as important, about how the finances were managed.

This year, as I pointed out in my remarks, we again have some questions about the way the government is reporting the books. We've pointed those things out: how the school capital is being moved off government books on to someone else's books; how it looks like, once again, some of the pension payments that were due are going to be moved to next fiscal year; and how some of these capital corporations, where we say we're selling assets—for example, we say we're selling off the GO trains; we say we're selling off government build-

ings. We're not really doing that. We're not really selling them off. We are simply refinancing them. We're buying them back again. We are artificially raising our revenues above what they should have been and we're taking on some new, long-term expenditures.

So the government is heading out once again to borrow substantial amounts of money, I suspect internationally. As I said before, the two largest issues of debt last year in the world, outside of countries—countries issue debt—were the two huge Ontario issues. I understand that they're not in foreign currency. I understand that they may have been sold in foreign currency and then swapped back into Canadian currency, which I suspect makes sense. But, increasingly, we're taking on enormous amounts of debt. As I say, our debt has doubled in just three years. When the Rae government came in, the province had just finished its first surplus in 20 years. Finally, a surplus budget. The Provincial Auditor says—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Phillips:** I'm glad there are some new members in the House, because I went over this earlier. Many of the viewers may not be aware that we have a Provincial Auditor in the province who looks objectively at the budgets and the books. So the auditor says this; this was what the auditor said in 1991, that Ontario has had only one surplus in 20 years. That was the year ending March 31, 1990, five months before Premier Rae took over; the only surplus in 20 years.

I like to raise that one because, firstly, it isn't the Liberal Party saying it; it is the independent Provincial Auditor. Secondly, we always have some fun with our Conservative friends because they love to talk about how well they can manage the finances. The fact is, they went 15 straight years never balancing the budget. The great Premier Davis never came close to balancing the budget. Even Treasurer McKeough, who was always regarded as a financial manager, never balanced the budget. It was only in the year ending March 31, 1990, that Ontario had its first surplus in 20 years.

The auditor goes on to point out there was also a surplus predicted for the next year, and that's the one where we get into some real heckling around the Legislature, because Bob Nixon presented that budget in April, predicting another surplus. So we would have had two straight surpluses, which would have been great.

But what happened, and the auditor points it out; three things happened. He said it was quite reasonable to expect that the revenues would have been what the budget predicted. But the extent of the recession was obviously unforeseen at the time of the budget. So no one could have seen that revenues were going to drop by \$1 billion. That was \$1 billion of the \$3-billion deficit.

**Mr Harnick:** David Peterson knew; that's why he

called the election.

**Mr Phillips:** One of the members is saying David Peterson knew. But I always remember Treasurer Laughren, whom I have a fair bit of—actually, I trust him.

**Mr Cousens:** I am surprised you are getting into this, Gerry.

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** He is tackling it head on.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, I just wanted to go over the situation that was left to the NDP. The second thing was that the NDP chose to write off three things that totalled about \$1 billion: \$200 million of teachers' pension funds that wasn't due till the following year, but they moved it up a year; they wrote off SkyDome—I understand SkyDome—it's all written off, it's gone, \$330 million, and blame the dastardly Liberals; and the Urban Transportation Development Corp, \$400 million. So I wanted to go back over that because I went over it earlier in my remarks but not all members were here, understandably very busy.

What was Premier Rae left with? The first surplus in 20 years, an unemployment rate lowest in the country, and now what are we faced with? A bill where we have to borrow \$16 billion.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt for his contribution to the debate.

Before recognizing any members for questions and/or comments, pursuant to standing order 34(a), the member for York Mills has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Education and Training concerning savings through the social contract to be paid to Metro Toronto property tax payers. This matter will be debated today at 6 pm.

Questions and/or comments, and I recognize the honourable member for Willowdale.

**Mr Harnick:** I listened intently to my friend from Scarborough-Agincourt, who I might say gave a very, very interesting speech. He reviewed with considerable accuracy the financial projections and the financial calculations and the records of this province over the course of the last hour and a half. The message that he had was a message of the necessity for sound fiscal management. He pointed out that we now have an accumulated deficit in this province of some \$60 billion. That accumulated deficit is up \$35 billion in the last five years.

1650

He did, with some accuracy, indicate that my party, when in government, had run deficits. In fact I think he's accurate. I don't think it was right that we ran deficits. If there's anywhere to criticize those governments, that's fair game and so be it.

But the fact is that in 43 years, actually in 120 years,

if you want to be really accurate, the accumulated deficit of this province was \$30 billion. In five short years of NDP and Liberal government, the deficit accumulated is up to \$60 billion, and with that kind of record, the province of Ontario now goes out to borrow \$16 billion more.

I don't know of one bank that would lend an individual who was maybe \$60,000 in the hole, who had no assets that were worth \$60 billion, that kind of money. The only thing I can see is a government ready to have a fire sale and a government that really has nowhere to go.

**Mr Sutherland:** I want to respond to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt because he did want to talk about the previous government's financial record of having the first surplus in 20 years. But the member for Scarborough-Agincourt was very selective in the information he used. He forgot to remind people that during their term in government, revenues for the province raised at a minimum, I think it was, around 11% each year that the Liberal government was in power. It was pretty easy with 7% or 8% economic growth in the so-called boom times and 11% increases in revenues each year to have a so-called surplus.

Our government has had to deal with revenue declines three years in a row and, at that time, dealing with that, has tried to maintain services, do effective job creation through Jobs Ontario Capital, get people back to work and get them the skills they need through Jobs Ontario Training. We're doing all that in the most difficult economic times since the 1930s. Not even the Tories in the last recession in 1982-83 had to deal with that. Revenues still increased 8% for their government in 1982-83 during the last recession. So when they talk about how well they can manage, they haven't had to manage in these difficult times of the huge unemployment rate caused to a large degree by federal policies.

I don't know if you saw the article the other day, Mr Speaker, this memo from the Bank of Canada that said that it didn't want unemployment rates to drop because they wouldn't be at natural levels. I can't believe that type of policy is dominating our Bank of Canada and the national policy.

But I do believe the people of Ontario need to understand that it was pretty easy for the Liberals to run a surplus with 11% revenue increases. Why weren't they paying down debt and why weren't they saving money for the rainy days?

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** I always enjoy listening to our Finance critic, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, because he's so accurate in what he says.

**Mr Sutherland:** Selective.

**Mr Grandmaître:** Absolutely balanced. He has notes on just about everything the Minister of Finance



and Mr Rae have said in the last three years, and he keeps reminding the NDP government of what it said when it was in the opposition and what it's doing while in government.

I'm not saying that we should forget the 1993 budget, because it's too serious to forget, but I think we should go back to 1990, the very first budget of the NDP government. Today we are paying for their miscalculation of 1990. But we have a responsibility, even in opposition, to criticize the government and also to help the government to get out of this crisis. We don't have all the solutions, but we've been offering some solutions to the government, trying to be helpful to the government.

Yet today, in second reading of Bill 25, they want to borrow \$16 billion, and if they do spend that \$16 billion, we'll be paying more in interest or very close to what we're investing in education. We have to put a stop to this, and I think the government should be listening to the opposition more often so that we can find a solution.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** You want us to spend more.

**Mr Grandmaitre:** No. The Minister of Environment and Energy is saying, "Spend." We're saying: "Invest. Don't spend but invest in people. Get people working. They will pay for your deficit. They will pay income tax."

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I want to rise for a couple of minutes and comment briefly on the remarks made by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, the Finance critic for the Liberal Party. Some of the things he had to say were spot on. I heard him talk about the call of the last election, when somebody had indicated that somebody had lied five times to the people. I read the Agenda for People and it certainly brought back some memories of what has happened. When the member talks about what has happened, he can remember the promises that were not kept.

While I was listening to the member's remarks, I had the opportunity to review a brief that I'm going to get from the Simcoe County Federation of Agriculture pretty soon. Looking at the brief, the farmers really have something positive to say about the economic and financial times:

"A farmer was overheard being asked by an urbanite how the recession was affecting him, and in his reply he said: 'What recession? It seems like things haven't changed much in nearly 10 years.' How true the statement is. Our farm products are purchasing only 15% to 40% of what they did two decades ago."

Farmers have lived with the recession that we're in. The member so statedly told us about the recession that we're in in Ontario. They talk about government financial policies. They talk about how they believe that

government must implement across-the-board reduction of expenditures to all programs and people. "Governments at all levels must become more economically efficient at providing their services." Are we becoming more efficient when we're looking at borrowing the highest dollars ever in the province, \$16 billion, to run this operation? Certainly, the viewers out there must have some great concerns about it.

They also go on and talk about the Fair Tax Commission. They talk about the farm tax rebate. They talk about the restructuring of the environmental bill. They talk about all the things that we talk about here in this House.

**The Speaker:** The member for Scarborough-Agincourt has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Phillips:** I appreciate the comments of the members, particularly the member for Oxford in that he was indicating how they're having to manage with high unemployment, dropping revenues and a very tough situation out there. I agree with him, but I would say to him, "Did you ever think that maybe the three years of your government have perhaps contributed a little bit to that problem out there and that the reason you're facing dropping revenues, high unemployment, all of those things, may be because you are mismanaging the economy?" That's why we keep raising these issues.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Government spending over the last 20 years, including the last three.

**Mr Phillips:** I love the Minister of Environment here yip-yapping, because they love to suck and blow, as we say.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I was agreeing with you, for crying out loud.

**Mr Phillips:** Oh, I'm sorry.

It was the Bob Rae caucus that said, "You spent too much money." Here's what Bob Rae said just before the election:

"The Ontario government has reacted to predictions of an economic slowdown"—that was the Liberal government—"by dropping its liberal pretence and showing its true conservative nature. The Liberal government is now spreading the message that 1990 will be a year of financial restraint. The Liberal majority on the finance committee agrees with this conservative philosophy and has recommended a course of restraint."

Of course, the NDP didn't agree with that. Restraint? Economic downturn? Having to watch our finances? No. Bob Rae said, "Go out and spend, spend, spend." Now Bob Rae is in as Premier and he's saying, "Gosh, did I say that?" Well, I've got it all here in black and white.

1700

**Mr Cousens:** We're debating here on June 29, Bill 25, at a time when the Legislature should have risen, having completed its business last Thursday. If this

House had come back when it was supposed to on March 22, rather than some three weeks later, and then proceeded with the business of the House in a businesslike fashion, we wouldn't be going on into the summer month of July, which we will be doing, dealing with unfinished business.

When you consider that this government hasn't been able to sequence the order of business in this Legislature any better than this, is it any wonder that we have problems in everything else that Mr Rae and his members of cabinet touch?

They made a commitment to this House some time ago that the Legislature would have a time schedule in which we would do business. They themselves are the ones who called the House back, instead of coming back as we were supposed to on March 22, some three weeks later. It took that long, I suppose, to write whatever it was that the Lieutenant Governor had to say in the speech from the throne.

Let it just be said that here we are in the Legislature at a time when we should have wrapped up this business and been on to other affairs.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm sure the member speaking would appreciate it if there were a quorum present to hear his presentation.

**The Speaker:** Table officer, will you see if there is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present. I recognize the honourable member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Inasmuch as this House is going to be continuing its work on into July, it is regrettable that we haven't been able to complete our work on schedule, and it has largely to do with the government's failure to organize its agenda a little bit better.

Now we're debating Bill 25. It only takes one page. It has less print than you have in many of the other ones we've dealt with, but it mainly calls for a total aggregate amount of \$16 billion in loan money that the province will be authorized to gather before the end of this fiscal year. Authorized "borrowing under this act shall be made after the 31st day of December, 1994," so in fact they're doing it a little bit in advance, and then if they run out of money between now and then, they can come back with another bill authorizing further debt. When I asked the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance, just how much interest would be paid on this, he didn't know.

It concerns me that when we start looking at the accumulated debt for the province of Ontario, we as members of this Legislature should understand just what

impact that has. We're now where the debt level in 1993-94 will hit an astronomical \$78.6 billion, and that's a 162% increase over the 1984-85 debt levels, a significant increase in the amount of debt.

Another word for "debt" is "deferred taxes," because what we're doing is putting off today to some time in the future when we will have to collect that money from future generations and future taxpayers in the province of Ontario. That's just another word for debt in the province: It's a future tax.

Even though this province has become accustomed to living beyond its means, at some point in time you have to come forward and pay the bill. We are now at the point where we're continuing to spend in such a way that it far exceeds the amount of money that comes as incoming to the province.

If any one of us, in running our own families or businesses, were to spend the kind of money beyond what we're earning at the rate this government does, it would bankrupt us. We couldn't begin to pay it back, and that's really what's starting to cripple the province. Just the debt interest is now becoming one of the major outlays of expenditures, instead of programs, instead of education, social services, environment or any of the other things that we want to do for job creation.

An increasing amount, 20 cents of every dollar—it will be up to over 30 cents of every dollar—goes just into debt interest. That's an awful lot of money, and it's that kind of spending now that takes away the opportunity to plan for things within our own lifetime.

It really points up the need that this province, this government has to find a way of living within its means during its term of office. California's done it. Other jurisdictions have done it. You are forced into living within your financial means. If you're going to have a deficit, there should be some way in which the public is going to be involved in that decision, rather than the government coming along, with total abandon to what people are talking about, and spending with total disregard to the long-term future.

In other words, there's little doubt that come 1995 the New Democrats will not be running the province of Ontario. The public have certainly had a chance to see Mr Rae and his government in action, and come the spring of 1995, probably right about now, we will be out on the hustings. Maybe by now the decision will have been made and the Bob Rae government's term of office, from September 6, 1990, will have been up and the public will have had a chance to speak on all the things that happened from that time till when the election's called.

We're dealing with so many facts as legislators. I want to pause for a moment, because this week we will celebrate Canada Day. How wonderful it is when you think that in spite of the fact that we've got all the



problems in this House, we should pause, reflect and be thankful for all we have as Canadians.

As I was coming into the Legislature today, I was realizing that in spite of the problems, it's still a pretty wonderful province and it's still a wonderful country to be part of. We don't do enough waving of the flag. Let's just hope that come July 1 this year, there'll be more of us who can stand up proud and say: "I am a Canadian. We are still together. We have survived 126 years. We are going into the year 2000 with a sense of confidence that as a country we will pull together in some way. We know there is a huge challenge, but as Canadians we have an identity and a purpose, not only within our own country but within the world. If only we as Canadians could somehow pull our ranks together and be somehow united in one voice for the important things, not only in our country but across the world, it would be a wonderful thing."

I am concerned about our country. I'm concerned that when a new Prime Minister is trying to call all the first ministers together for a meeting, some would be reluctant to go. In fact, politics is constantly being played. I don't know how we do it, but as a politician I'm becoming personally very, very tired of the constant game of politics that we're always involved with.

I think the public is disenchanted with us as well. If all we can do is stand up and rant and rave and criticize and not come forward with some way of solving the bigger issues for this country, they tar us all with the same brush and accuse us of not caring for our country or our province or our constituents.

1710

Somehow, the parliamentary assistant system that we're into fails to give us that opportunity to participate in the big decisions of the province.

We're dealing now with a bill of \$16 billion for loan money for the province. I can assure the people who are observing what goes on in this place that it's a one-party government run by the government in power and that the decisions that will be made with this money are not made by consensus of the people in this House but are made very largely by the cabinet and the inner cabinet of the government.

Mr Rae, I'm suggesting that there's got to be some way in which we start bringing out the best of all the ideas that can exist within the House. There should be a way in which together we're dealing with the problems we've got. We can have an expenditure review. There must be ways in which we can all participate.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** What about the finance committee? What about public accounts?

**Mr Cousens:** The Minister of Environment and Energy is saying the public accounts committee. That's one committee that has been working well, but there are many others that have not really had the openness of all

members to be able to participate honestly and openly to present alternative points of view. What happens is that the government whip comes in and forces a vote according to government lines.

I sense a growing frustration, certainly within me and within my constituents, at our inability to come and grapple with the issues that are tearing people apart out there as we look at our society today. It is the leadership that can come from this province that can help change it, to provide jobs for youth and for people of every age who want to work, to provide services for people who need those services.

I see that there's a problem developing with the aging of the population. Every one of us is feeling that day by day as we get on. But certainly the seniors who are out there are in a position where they're requiring more and more services, at more and more cost and they're more and more worried that their pensions and the other programs might not continue.

We as a society have a deep and genuine responsibility to make sure we are providing the services for our total constituency, young, middle-aged, old and all, that they can somehow find an environment in which they can succeed and fulfil themselves. As a government, as a challenge for all of us in the Legislature, is to deal with the needs of people.

I see another thing which is the aging factor, and that's the aging factor of our infrastructure. The whole infrastructure as you see it across the province is now deteriorating at such a rate that there is great concern that we will ever have the money to rebuild the sewers and the waterways—

**Mr Harnick:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe we have a quorum present.

**The Speaker:** Will the table officer count to determine a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present.

**Mr Cousens:** Mr Speaker, if we're going to be here, I suppose the message by the person who called the quorum is that people should have to suffer through my speech. That being the case, it's nice to see a quorum present.

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** Are you going to start at the beginning again?

**Mr Cousens:** I'm not going to start at the beginning again. No, I don't think I could even do that.

The cost to rebuild and to strengthen the infrastructure, which has to do with the sewers, the roads and all the services that make up our society, is an ongoing development cost that has to be met. There is another cost, and that is just the cost to make this province more

responsive to the year 2000. There have to be ways in which we can improve our efficiency and the functioning of government.

We're doing so many things the way we did in the past. We need to come along with a fresh look and say: How can we begin to rationalize different levels of government? How can we remove the duplication between governments at the federal, provincial, regional and municipal levels, remove those areas where we're overlapping and somehow become more efficient as a country?

There's a whole sense in which we have to realize that there is only one taxpayer who is paying the total levy of all the different levels of government we've got. It's important for that taxpayer to begin to get value for their dollar and that the governments responsible for it remove the duplication, remove the waste and have a sense of using the money wisely and well.

As we collect another \$16 billion, living beyond our means, it's just another opportunity for us to say as politicians and as parliamentarians that we want to begin to work more efficiently and effectively together to make the best use of that dollar.

We have had, for some time, a crisis, and it's a crisis created by this government and the one before, a crisis in spending, a crisis in taxing and a crisis in borrowing. Business that has survived something of the terrible ordeal of the last few years of recession is now ready to recover and beginning to gain some confidence that there will be some certainty and some stability.

Business has been rocked over the last number of years due to all the things that have been happening in this country: rocked during the 1980s by the very high interest rates and the very uneven recovery that took place during the mid-1980s; heavy political uncertainties during the Meech accord; an overheated Ontario economy; yet another constitutional go-round in 1991-92.

At the same time, there was a major world economic restructuring going on which all began to impact on what happens here in the province of Ontario. What happened is that as Ontario, as part of the whole world economic scene, tried to survive and tried to plan for the future, we were really victims of not only government incompetence here at the provincial level, but a whole world scene that was going through massive change.

We're seeing every country trying to face up to the new challenges of the 1990s as they form their new governments, as they try to get the feel for democracy. What interesting and fantastic times we live in, when you think of what's happened in eastern Europe, when you look at what's happening now in China and its tremendous growth and potential. You feel the sense of people around the world starting to take control of their own destinies, the empowerment of business people to

go out there and take part in the world economy. It's interesting that so much of the Canadian economy is being fuelled because of exports and business outside the country.

But what we're beginning to see is that we as a country have to get over some of the economic instability we've had, and we've got to make sure that whatever government does, it stabilizes those things.

**1720**

I'm concerned about the uncertainty we have going into the mid-1990s. Unemployment continues to be at an extremely high rate. We have now a situation where some 12% of the people in the province Ontario are unemployed. It's higher when you're dealing with young people and it's higher when you're dealing with people in their mid-50s and -60s who want to work. It's hard for those who aren't trained or educated. There are just tremendous pockets of communities across our province where, because the industry is dying, the lumber industry is going through change or the mine has closed, they're looking for that chance to find new work so that they can pay their way.

Canadians have that sense of desire, yet what we're sensing here now today is a growing unease over what the future can contain. As unemployment continues to grow, or at least to stay the same, we're becoming accustomed to a new playing field. It's a rough playing field for those who are in business today. They're working harder for less. Most people have suffered declines in their income over the last several years, significant cutbacks in their take-home pay, just because they are having to work harder to hold down the same old job.

At the same time as we have an uncertain time in the future, the province comes out with more taxes, again making us more uncompetitive and putting us in a position where we're not able, as a province, to be attractive to outside countries or investors who would otherwise—and did in the past—look at Ontario as an ideal place to invest.

We're looking at a province where deficits are out of control. That's part of what we're debating today, another \$16 billion the province will borrow in order to put money in the bank to pay out for things we aren't paying for today. It's a deferred tax on the future.

What's happening is that as a province and as a country we're not coordinating all our services. We are not developing a common economic policy where, as provinces and as a federal government, we're somehow, as all Canadians, putting Canada first and saying that not only do we believe in it but we're working towards a goal.

I sincerely believe that the time as we move into July 1 is the time for us as Canadians to act together now responsibly in dealing with these problems so that we



can come out of the next few years with a more capable organization, one that's responsive to the needs of the 1990s, one that has become lean and mean, the way business has, knowing that in order to be fiscally responsible and give value for money we're actually doing things better than we were in the past.

Lay out for ourselves meaningful challenges so that we, as a province and as a country, are moving towards realistic goals we can achieve that begin to balance the budget. One of the things is that we can then restructure so many parts of government where waste exists now.

Restructure our health. We have federal health, we have provincial health and we have regional health offices. Somehow bring them together and consolidate them.

The welfare system where you have all kinds of different situations evolving in different communities: Find some way that every level of government has a coordinated effort on welfare. The same for education. We have to have a coordinated economic and fiscal plan on these major areas within our country. Where there is duplication at one level, eliminate it, get rid of it and find a way of being more efficient.

We could function better, but that hasn't been a goal or an ideal or a mission that any government seems to have taken under its belt and said it wants to do something about.

Then, as a government here in Ontario, truly come up with a restraint program that allows us to get away from increasing our government spending every year.

This year, when the government came out with its \$17-billion possible deficit, there wasn't anyone in the province who knew what was going on who didn't disbelieve them. In other words, we knew the government was concocting a number of a \$17-billion deficit for 1993-94 when in fact it was blown out of proportion. That would have been the deficit if they'd spent every dollar on every program that they were just thinking about, rather than the programs they had already put into motion over the last couple of years.

What we really need to do is find a way in which this government and every government can reduce its participation in everything, find a way of reducing government spending and find ways of reducing the taxes. We have reached the tax wall, and the people in this province, though they don't know yet the impact of the budget, which I'll be commenting on in a moment—but it has serious ramifications on their paycheque when it starts in July, and that retroactive tax the government has brought in, in the budget that was presented by Mr Laughren, is just another example where the government has shown little or no restraint.

What we need to do as well is look at coordinating the tax policy for every level of government in Canada. We have too many layers of government. We have

enough government for 130 million people, let alone the 30 million who make up all of Canada. If we could begin to understand that we can't afford it, then we would begin to eliminate certain functions and certain services, allow another level to be responsible for it.

Let's begin to look at true reform: reform in taxation; reform in the way you collect taxes; reform so that you can motivate people who are working for the public service; reform so that the people who make up Canada have a sense that they are participating in it; reform in the political system so that democracy is something that begins to really inspire us, that we want to participate.

What a tragedy that in the two by-elections recently held in Metropolitan Toronto, in Don Mills and St George-St David, the number of people who came out and voted was under 50%. In fact, it was 42% and 44% of the people in those ridings who came out and voted. There is an apathy in this country because people largely don't feel that they can participate in the political system and in democracy, and they have a sense that it's out of their control. Well, it is, because even here in opposition there is so little we can do to cause the government to rethink its position. There is so little we can do to stop them; there's nothing we can do. The government has the power to do what it wants, as long as it wants, as long as it's in power. Talk about democracy. It isn't democracy. It's a system of government where we're elected democratically, but while that government's in power it has the option to do what it wants, when it wants, how it wants, with total disregard to the promises it made before it was elected—and that's the case with this bunch—and as well, to just keep spending beyond our means.

The concern that we as Canadians have to have is that there is ownership by all of us in what is going on within government at every level, and that government begins to be truly accountable to the people on an ongoing basis between elections. That is part of the demise of a strong democratic government. I don't know what the model is going to be, but we're not even looking at it. We aren't even beginning to assess the ways in which government could begin to be revitalized and activated. The whole system is sick and no one's doing anything about it.

What we need to do is begin now to have an all-party task force that begins to look at ways in which we can revitalize government processes so that the public begins to understand what we're doing and why we're doing it. We have a tremendously powerful tool through the people, to represent them and to do things better, and yet what we do is more of the same and more of the same without coming out with a fresh dream for Ontario and for Canada. What we do is—

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** That's it. A man with dreams and vision.

**Mr Cousens:** Well, what we have is the dream of

the Ontario New Democratic government, and that's what we're paying for with this bill of \$16 billion. When I start looking at what another billion dollars cost, it's hard to imagine what \$16 billion will do, \$16 billion that we don't have as a percentage of what we're talking about in what it takes to run government. It's a huge part of it. There isn't a company that could continue to spend beyond its means the way the government does, and that becomes the issue we have to face up to; face up to our responsibility as parliamentarians; go to the deep, true issues that are the fabric of what Parliament is all about, instead of just—we come along and we'll have more bills and we'll have more issues and there'll be more things to debate and talk about.

1730

What we have not begun to do is deal with how the system is failing so many people, how there are many people who have suffered through the worst economic recession since the 1930s, how we in government are still talking and are not doing enough for them, how our system now is where 37% of those elected are in power and don't have to regard what the other 63% of the population represented by the opposition parties have to say.

Somehow the democratic system isn't working when you have the abuse of power that is going on with the present system here in Ontario. It's fundamental to what this bill is all about; it's fundamental to the tremendous dismay and frustration that I have and people I talk with have about government.

I am concerned when, as a Legislature, we're coming now to the very important decisions that will have to be made, and it has to do with how we spend our money, because how you spend your money reflects what it is that you want to do with it. It shows your priorities.

The government's three-pronged approach to the economy in 1993-94 has three parts to it. The first part is the expenditure control plan, where some \$2.4 billion would be set aside and saved through cutbacks in spending. As painful as it is, our caucus has indicated support for the government in its intention to cut back on government spending.

I would like to think that in cutting back on government spending by \$2.4 billion in 1993-94, the government would spend even less than last year, but that's not the case. Even though there will be an expenditure control plan to reduce government spending by \$2.4 billion, the government this year will still spend more than it did last year, \$160 million more than it spent in fiscal 1992-93.

That is a concern. It just doesn't make sense, but the problem is that we've got to put a lid on somewhere. The government came through with a series of programs where there would be expenditure cutbacks. The specifics within that are such that I don't like all of them, but the fact is that the New Democratic government has

said in a fiscal way that it will cut back spending. That's one of their programs, and our caucus is on record in support of that.

The second part is the government's decision to have a social contract. The social contract would be a new arrangement between the province and its 900,000-plus, its close to one million, employees that work for the province of Ontario. They make up close to 100,000 people that work within the direct ministries of the province and the 900,000 others who are out in the municipalities, the universities, schools and hospitals and in the crown corporations who make up the province of Ontario public service, just a huge number of people when you think of it. In the province of Ontario, at least one in 10 is working for government in some way. It's really one in four when you start looking at those actually in the workforce who are being subsidized and paid for by the taxpayers to serve them.

I have to say that as an integral part of what the government's plan is, though our party is supporting that on second reading and did, there is no doubt that our caucus is not committed to voting for the social contract on third and final reading unless a number of amendments are accepted by the government. That could mean that the government could lose Bill 48. It ties into this, Mr Speaker, because we're dealing with borrowing right now.

But our caucus is prepared to submit a number of amendments that we hope will begin to deal with the burgeoning costs of the public service. We know that the government has said it wants to save some \$2 billion in salaries through the social contract. They have presented a number of ways in which they are going to do it through the existing bill, and our caucus will come in with a number of amendments that we hope will address many of the concerns that the people in teaching, in hospitals and throughout the public service are concerned with.

Those very concerns, if our amendments are met and if they're voted on and we can gain support for them, and the government can show that it's not just going to operate in a dictatorial, draconian way, as it has for this long time—there is a chance that the government will have to look more seriously at our amendments, because who knows how many of the New Democrats are going to back out and not vote on third reading for the social contract?

That's not for me to guess or assume. I can only represent what our caucus is trying to do, and that is to come forward with responsible suggestions and amendments that can cause the government to rethink how in fact it can best meet the needs of the public service and at the same time reduce the costs of government. There are many, many ways in which this can be done.

I have no doubt that what the government has proposed with its suggestion is going to have a short-term



gain, but at the end of the three years, if it lasts that long—in fact I think there's a good chance before the next election that the New Democratic government in Ontario will cancel the social contract. At that time they would have some rationale that says, "Things are better and there's an election coming, so we therefore are going to withdraw it." That's going to be one of the amendments that we have in the bill, so that we can call upon the government to have a review of the bill on an ongoing basis each year.

**Mr Harnick:** Mr Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum present.

**The Speaker:** I ask the table officer to determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Speaker:** A quorum is now present. I recognize the honourable member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** As we review what the government's fiscal program is for 1993-94, the social contract is a very integral part to it, and I just want to highlight that our party is anxious to see something that has long-term benefit to reduce the size and scope of government.

The leader of our party, Mr Harris, the member for Nipissing, has been eloquent on this subject ever since he became leader of our party over three years ago. He has consistently said if you freeze salaries—that's the first thing you should do. The second thing at this point is freeze hiring.

Both of those factors will have not the short-term, panic-stricken gain that the government's going to get out of the social contract that they have, but it will over the long term, because there will be a restructuring in government and the government could be downsized significantly. We're talking in the order of 55,000 people over three years, and that amounts to over \$2.5 billion in long-term, continuing savings by having reduced the public service. Then, by virtue of having held salaries for all for three years, it puts a lid on that spending level.

That's painful. I realize that there are people who will get promotions and they will have an increase that goes with it, and there will be certain areas where an ambulance driver or a fire person or someone else in an essential service will be able to be replaced and brought in—or teachers. You're going to have to make sure that some people are retiring and others are moving through. That all is part of having a tighter system.

Business has gone through it and has somehow come out of this recession leaner and meaner and stronger in order to go ahead into the future. As we look at the social contract legislation that the government has, we have very, very deep and genuine concerns. There isn't any doubt that there is no certainty, there is no guaran-

tee that our caucus will support this bill, Bill 48, on the social contract on third and final reading. I'm just giving notice again on that.

1740

What we're talking about here in this bill is the borrowing of \$16 billion. That's really quite a part of the budget that was brought in by the Treasurer. In his budget of May 19, he goes into what our debt is. Our debt has been growing and will continue to grow. For this year, it'll be \$78.6 billion, the accumulated debt of the province of Ontario, and the province continues to talk about an increase in debt, that it'll be up in 1994-95 to over \$85 billion, and by the year 1995-96 to \$90 billion.

May I say, because the Minister of Finance has not yet hit a number correctly on any of his projections, that it's highly likely that by the time this government comes up for re-election in the spring of 1995, the total accumulated debt for the province could well be over \$100 billion. At that point, just think of the interest rate that we're paying and the costs to service such a debt. Not only does the debt increase; so does our inability to pay it down and pay it off.

We have a problem in this province in that we continue to deal with half-truths. I had the pleasure last week of attending the standing committee on finance and economic affairs. It was a chance for our economics committee to listen to the Treasurer make a presentation. As affable a man as he is, he has a way of presenting his data that would make you think things are just fine. The headlines he gives: "Recovery is Under Way," "Inflation Edges Down," "Financial Markets Support Recovery," "US Recovery Continuing."

Then he goes on to say, "Impact of the Budget on Economic Recovery." This is the lie that we live with in the province. He said, "The budget is aimed at achieving a reasonable balance among competing priorities. It has kept vital public services intact. It has maintained spending on job training and infrastructure.... At the same time, it has ensured that the deficit is on a reliable downward course."

All I really want to point out by repeating some of the words of the Minister of Finance is that when he says we're on to a strong economic renewal and recovery, he is living without all the facts as the business people are talking about them. I didn't want to use words like "lie" or things like that in the Legislature, because that just would aggravate the seals.

When he comes along and says, "The budget will stimulate investment in the province," I can't believe it. How can you, for a moment, say that this budget of the province, which increases taxes, not only on individuals but on corporations, is going to stimulate investment in the province? That is not true. He says, "It increases confidence in the economy's future." It doesn't. He says, "It creates confidence that no more major tax

increases will be needed in future years." Isn't that sweet news? If you don't call tolls on highways another form on tax. There's just no doubt that the government, through regulation and other means, will continue to put its hands in the pockets of Ontario taxpayers right into the future.

But he's saying he is stimulating investment in the province. He says, "The tax increase package was focused so that it will have a minimal negative impact on the dynamic sectors of the economy." The dynamic sector of the economy is those who are out there running their own business, those people who are trying to make a go of it. They're investing their own money. They're generating a few jobs. They're running a farm, they're running any kind of business, and yet every one of them is going to be taxed more this year, taxed not only on services that they have from the government; taxed on their insurance and their social benefits and taxed as well in their provincial income tax.

I have to say that when the Treasurer comes along and starts bragging about his budget and the fiscal policy of this government stimulating investment in the province of Ontario, he's got it wrong and he hasn't begun to understand that there's just so many other factors to it.

We're facing the problem as well of our credit rating. Who knows what it's going to become? Will we slip as low as Saskatchewan? We're AA right now, and there's no doubt that the monetary markets and the rating agencies are watching Ontario with a microscope to make sure that what goes on here somehow brings the deficit under \$10 billion. Whoa. Under \$10 billion and we're succeeding. What a rotten success story that is, to be able to say, "Hey, we brought the deficit under \$10 billion." There's nothing to brag about in that. It wasn't all that long ago that we were upset when the deficit was just becoming \$10 billion. Now we're used to it.

We've got to get used to what is right and proper for the province of Ontario, live within our means, stop living beyond our means, go for a balanced budget, see how long it will take to eliminate the debt. A debt is nothing more than a deferred tax, and we are going to tax our children and our children's children and their children after them if we don't do something to reduce the amount of deficit and debt that this province is incurring.

There isn't any doubt that the province is in trouble. We're in trouble, and until the government begins to understand that we're going to do something about it, then the province will continue to just sort of float rather than move forward; it will continue to just stagnate rather than grow and be dynamic; it will continue to have a 12% unemployment rate rather than to have the growth where people want to invest in the province of Ontario.

That's one thing that happened during the early

1980s: There was a recession on but the government in power at the time created a climate for investment. What this government does is create a climate for people to get the heck out. Why would you want to come along and invest in the province of Ontario with Bill 40 and the labour legislation? Why would you want to invest in Ontario when all the money you earn is going to be taxed? Why do you want to come along and settle here? The most beautiful jewel in this country, Ontario, and yet what we've got is a government that's driving us into the wall, driving us into the ground. So we come along now, and today, meekly and quietly, let's go and borrow another \$16 billion. Come on.

I want to look for a moment at some of the recommendations our caucus made prior to the budget, none of which have been accepted by this government. That's part of the frustration of government, that there's no way in which people in this place, other than the inner cabinet, decide what's going to happen. In fact, the sad part is that the backbenchers, who are well represented in the House right now, have no participation in this process. It's announced to them. They don't know what's in the budget until the day the Treasurer or Minister of Finance comes and tables his budget. That's why it's kept under wraps and is very secret, because he's gathered all the data, gleaned it out and comes forward with it.

I'll tell you that in my years as a parliamentarian here, and it's over 12 years now since I've been elected to represent the great riding of Markham and I'm glad to represent the people of Markham, I just wish I could do more about what's happening in cabinet by being there to influence the decisions, but I'm not; I'm sitting in opposition with 21 others who really care about what can happen in government.

Our committee, two of our members, brought forward a series of recommendations on behalf of our caucus during the pre-budget consultations. I barely have enough time to cover them, but they have to do with ways in which we can operate as a province and as a government without continuing to borrow money.

Get out of the habit; break the habit. It's like anything else that takes you over. It's like alcohol or gambling or drugs. It becomes habit-forming when you start living beyond your means. Break the habit of spending money you don't have. That's what you have to do. Don't continue to be habit-forming on these things.

The kind of thing we have suggested in our recommendations is, first, "that the 1993 budget should not increase any taxes or fees and should not introduce any new taxes or fees." Don't increase any taxes or fees and don't introduce new taxes or fees. Well, I'll tell you, they did it. This government brought in the new taxes. Don't underestimate what they did to the Ontario taxpayer. They increased our personal income tax by



3% retroactively. What a sleazy, dirty, rotten trick by a government.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Cousens:** That's right. Retroactive? Come on. There's no honour among thieves. You guys are thieves. You're stealing from the taxpayers through your increased personal income taxes. You've introduced the sales tax on auto insurance, on group plans. You've introduced the tax on beer and wine in self-made establishments; public land rental use increases; snow-mobile registration increases; parking fees increase; warranty parts and labour shall be subject to the sales tax and on and on and on. Is there any doubt? Here's a government that found ways to increase taxes, and did it ever do it.

1750

The other thing is that most Ontarians don't understand how bad this budget is going to be because most of them haven't been taxed yet. Wait till July 1 starts and they get their first paycheque in July. Wait till the phone starts to ring: "Why has so much money has been deducted from my paycheque?" I'll tell you why: 61% of the Ontario government tax comes off.

It's terrible what you're doing, and the people haven't seen it yet. There would have been an outcry if they had begun to see something in their pocket earlier. You saw it from the insurance brokers. You saw it from a few. It will begin to happen now, and the people in Ontario will not forgive the New Democratic government for the hefty tax increases, a \$2-billion total tax increase this government is going to collect in one fiscal year. What greed, what poor spending, what a horrible example. The only one you ever beat was Bob Nixon, who had the previous high. Now you've beat him. So there you go.

Our second recommendation was that the commercial concentration tax levied in the greater Toronto area should be repealed. Do you know something? A lot of people say it's been repealed. It has? I haven't seen the bill in the Legislature yet. I suppose we'll debate it some time from now. I haven't even seen it tabled. I should have, but it isn't there. But in the budget it has been announced that the government is going to repeal the commercial concentration tax. That's just fine.

What has happened, though, is that at the same time the government has come along and is going to charge money on parking meters. They're probably going to make more money on parking meters than they did on the commercial concentration tax. So what they've done is that they've taken away the commercial concentration tax, which no one liked, and slipped in an 8% provincial sales tax on parking. So where's the win on it?

I don't know, and to get an answer out of this government is just next to impossible. You can write them a letter and you might get an answer a year later.

You just don't get answers. Ask anyone. It's become the most inefficient, incompetent group of administrators you've ever seen. Ontario, which once ran things well, is now just running into the ground. There isn't any sense of urgency in dealing with the needs of people.

Anyway, I'll ask the government again and again: How much money are you going to make on the new sales tax on parking meters and on parking lots? You got rid of the commercial concentration tax, but how much more are you making by having another tax instead?

Our caucus is saying, hey, don't increase the taxes so much. Get the lid on it. Get the lid on your spending. Get the lid on your programs. Have a review of what you're doing. Don't continue on this spending spree of money you don't own, money you don't have, money that's going to be part and parcel of the future inheritance of those who come after us.

Another point we made in our recommendations: "To prevent the flight of capital from Ontario and to maintain a positive investment environment and to encourage a return to profitability, that the government include in the 1993 budget a clear and definitive statement that it will not, during its term of office, impose a wealth or estate tax or a corporate minimum tax." Well, they didn't bring in the wealth tax and they didn't bring in the estate tax, but yes, there they did. Maybe we did an injustice to the province by even suggesting in our pre-budget consultation not to do it. If we say don't do it, they do it.

Anyway, we genuinely believe it's a demotivator for business. It's just another example of the government trying to skim more money off the people who are trying to get business going here in Ontario. I've asked questions on this particular issue in the Legislature and have never received a satisfactory answer from the Minister of Finance. Certainly the presentation that was made by the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto pointed to the fact that in the United States, where they've had a minimum corporate tax in the past, they're removing that. They're backing away from it because it has become such a serious demotivator for business people. It just takes away that incentive they would otherwise have to continue to invest in a certain jurisdiction.

We do not need more taxes. We need to run government more efficiently. We need to review programs. We need to do a number of things.

There are a number of other points I have: "That for the 1993-94 year, the province should hold spending on its operating account at the 1992-93 level and inaugurate a multi-year program spending freeze with the objective of balancing the operating account in three years." In other words, everybody has to start finding moneys wherever they can. Hold the level down.

Here in this year, 1993-94, the government, with all the spending restraint program and everything else, is going to spend more money than it did last year. People don't believe that, but they are.

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** Why?

**Mr Cousens:** You ask why. A lot of it has to do with all the special programs the province is bringing out. There isn't any doubt, and we mention this further in our recommendations, that the cost of your housing program is just inordinate. In fact, I'll go right to it. It's one of the biggest, most costly enterprises that the province has ever had. It's subsidizing bricks and mortar. We're saying, "The government should revamp its housing policy to help individuals and families meet their housing needs through direct shelter payments instead of planning to build another 20,000 housing units." You just don't begin to understand how large a dollar it is, because the subsidies that the government could pay would be a pittance compared to the operating costs of the new structures the government's going to be building.

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** You don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr Cousens:** The honourable member says we don't know what we're talking about. That's all part of the arrogance, the absolute arrogance of the New Democrats, who say no one knows what they're talking about except them. You come along, spend the money and don't even give a flying hoot about anyone else. Oh no, anyone else who criticizes what you have to say is arrogant. It is not arrogance. It's facing up to the reality and the truth, and there's no way we can get you guys to listen. Why don't you understand—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Middlesex.

**Mr Cousens:** —that there's another point of view rather than the socialist viewpoint that you've got, that there is a way of going ahead to do something about it, without just spending money without taking some accounting of it. That's the lunacy of a socialist government in Ontario. We don't need you any more. I'm telling you there is a problem here, and the problem is still spending too much.

We're saying you can save money on providing proper housing for people by giving a shelter allowance

rather than building brand-new places. You don't need to build them.

I have a friend with an apartment building and he knows exactly what it is. They moved from a minimal cost in an apartment building and now they're going into a plush, three-bedroom apartment. They're only a single couple. They've gone from his one-bedroom place to a three-bedroom place in Ajax, totally built and paid for by the province of Ontario at a cost over \$300,000 a unit to build. He now has an empty place and they've moved into Ontario-provided housing: \$300,000 to build, and then a continuing maintenance and operating and everything else. Why not look at some subsidy to help these people out instead of just building 20,000 more units this year? What a waste.

And here today we're coming in for another \$16 billion, and what are we supposed to do about it? Vote for it? I'm not voting for it. No way. You're not getting another cent. Come on, live within your means. Learn to live within the money you've got. You're not in a position to continue to spend as outrageously as you are now. We've got sincere and serious recommendations to make, and this government should start paying attention to them.

I'm running out of time. Since it's 6 of the clock, I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Speaker:** It's not necessary to move the adjournment of the debate. I recognize the honourable member for York Mills.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I was informed earlier today by the Minister of Education and Training that he would be unable to attend tonight's late show and has requested me to defer it. I would ask unanimous consent of the House to defer the late show till next week.

**The Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

Is there a business statement?

**Hon Shelley Martel (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** With respect to the business that will be dealt with tomorrow, it will be announced tomorrow morning.

**The Speaker:** It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 1800.





# CONTENTS

Tuesday 29 June 1993

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	
<b>Closing of campgrounds</b>	
Mr Cleary	2073
<b>Water supply</b>	
Mr Murdoch	2073
<b>St John Ambulance</b>	
Mr White	2073
<b>District office relocation</b>	
Mrs Fawcett	2073
<b>Tax increases</b>	
Mr Jackson	2074
<b>Jaemi and Taelor Douglas</b>	
Mr Fletcher	2074
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Caplan	2074
<b>Highway safety</b>	
Mr Turnbull	2075
<b>Canada Day</b>	
Mr Malkowski	2075

ORAL QUESTIONS	
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mr Elston	2075
Mr Rae	2075, 2076, 2078
Mr Mahoney	2076
Mr Harris	2078
<b>Air quality</b>	
Mr Offer	2076
Mr Wildman	2077
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr Harris	2079
Mr Rae	2079
<b>Ontario economy</b>	
Mr Phillips	2081
Mr Rae	2081
<b>First ministers' meeting</b>	
Mr Harris	2082
Mr Rae	2082

<b>Northern health services</b>	
Mr Bisson	2082
Mrs Grier	2083
<b>Correctional facility</b>	
Mrs O'Neill	2083
Mr Silipo	2083
<b>Photo radar</b>	
Mr Turnbull	2084
Mr Pouliot	2084
<b>Community economic development</b>	
Mr Martin	2084
Miss Martel	2084
<b>Acquired immune deficiency syndrome</b>	
Mr Murphy	2085
Mrs Grier	2085

PETITIONS	
<b>Closure of agricultural college</b>	
Mr Elston	2086
<b>Health care</b>	
Mr Murdoch	2086
Mr Hayes	2088
Mr Jim Wilson	2088
<b>International trade</b>	
Mr White	2086
<b>Bicycling safety</b>	
Mr Cleary	2086
<b>Native hunting and fishing</b>	
Mr McLean	2086
<b>School facilities</b>	
Mr Mills	2087
<b>Seniors' health services</b>	
Mrs Fawcett	2087
<b>Abortion</b>	
Mrs Marland	2087

<b>Gambling</b>	
Mrs MacKinnon	2087
Mr Beer	2087
Mrs Witmer	2087
Mr Wessinger	2088
<b>Retail store hours</b>	
Mr Eddy	2088
<b>Beer and wine tax</b>	
Mrs Marland	2088
<b>Bruce generating station</b>	
Mr Elston	2088, 2089

FIRST READINGS	
<b>Election Statute Law Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 57</b>	
Mr Sorbara	2089
<b>City of Mississauga Act, 1993, Bill Pr46</b>	
Mr Mahoney	2089

SECOND READINGS	
<b>Ontario Loan Act, 1993, Bill 25</b>	
Mr Sutherland	2089, 2090
Mr Cousens	2089, 2104
Mr Elston	2090
Mr Stockwell	2090
Mr Perruzza	2090
Mr Phillips	2091, 2103
Mr Harnick	2102
Mr Sutherland	2102
Mr Grandmaitre	2102
Mr McLean	2103

OTHER BUSINESS	
<b>Visitors</b>	
The Speaker	2075

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 29 juin 1993

PREMIÈRE LECTURE	
<b>Loi de 1993 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne les élections, projet de loi 57</b>	
M. Sorbara	2089





**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 30 June 1993

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 30 juin 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Wednesday 30 June 1993

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### DAY CARE

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Premier a serious matter arising in the region of Peel as a result of your social contract.

Last week I was informed that, as a result of the reduction by the province of its grant payments to the region, regional council on June 24 resolved that the family day care program be cut in its entirety effective September 3 of this year. That means that 932 day care spaces will be eliminated. The region is requesting that the provincial cutback be reduced.

The action as a result of the social contract has a devastating effect not only on the providers of family day care spaces but also on the individuals who need these spaces. I have been told that many of these spaces are needed by single moms who have made a go of it and have found jobs. The dilemma they face is that there are no day care spaces available in Peel to meet the 932 space needs. They will in fact have to leave their jobs this September.

Minister, Premier, I ask you to approve the option provided by the region of Peel. Meet with them. Let us save this program which provides quality day care for children and allows people who have found jobs to keep them.

##### SPECIAL SERVICES AT HOME PROGRAM

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I would like to once again bring to the attention of the Minister of Community and Social Services the very urgent need for maintaining the special services at home program. Members of this House know that I have raised this issue several times now in the House.

Special services at home provides at-home assistance to parents with developmentally handicapped children. Many parents in Wellington county have seen their allocation of hours in this program severely reduced or eliminated altogether as demand for the service has grown.

Let me be very clear: This is a call for a reallocation of existing government spending, not a call for increased spending. Instead of properly helping families with disabled children, we see the government spending approximately \$800 million to build non-profit housing units in this province, units which are not necessary given the high vacancy rates at reasonable rents across this province.

I'd like to read some comments from parents who

have written to me expressing their concern and desperation regarding the cuts in service. Typical is this one from Mary Ellen Brown of Fergus:

"My feeling is that your government needs to rethink their priorities in funding. You and your government have spent millions of dollars on snowmobile trails, but cannot find it in your budget or your heart to fund a program such as special services at home adequately."

I say again I hope that the minister will make more resources available for the special services at home program through a reallocation of existing resources within the government.

This is the fifth time I have raised this issue in the Legislature. I say to the Minister of Community and Social Services: Disabled kids in Wellington county need your help. When will you hear their cry?

##### INTERNATIONAL FREEDOM FESTIVAL

**Mr George Dadamo (Windsor-Sandwich):** It's that time of the year when I'm able to announce another Windsor festival. The 1993 International Freedom Festival is already in progress and promises to be spectacular and of course fascinating.

The 35th annual International Freedom Festival is a celebration which brings two nations together in harmony. The province of Ontario, the city of Windsor and of course the state of Michigan come hand in hand and celebrate the freedoms we both enjoy.

Hands Across the Border has become a tradition we savour and look forward to. This aspect of the festival occurs on the Ambassador Bridge, where hundreds of people join their hands in a gesture of goodwill.

The festival is highlighted by the Canada Day parade, held Thursday, July 1, at noon on Ouellette Avenue. This year we celebrate Canada's 126th birthday.

On the roster this year: the Canada Day family picnic, the great bed race, Brights Wines waiter-waitress relay, singer Michelle Wright, the Motown Sound and the Johnny Trudell Orchestra entertain at the Cleary International Centre on Riverside Drive. Pancake breakfasts, tugboat races, battle of the bands, windsurfing demonstrations and a US-Canada coast guard search-and-rescue demonstration are just part of the fun.

Again this year the highlight will be the massive fireworks display on the Detroit River. This annual and historic display will last about 40 minutes and be witnessed by an estimated 500,000 spectators lining both sides of the border.

The 35th Windsor-Detroit International Freedom Festival is on and continues to July 4. My Windsor colleagues and myself congratulate Terry O'Rourke and her dynamic staff of volunteers for another super presentation.

## SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** For some time now the Liberal Party has expressed concerns about the functioning of the special investigations unit under this government. As it stands now, the SIU does not have the confidence of the police or of the public it was created to serve.

Remarks attributed to the director of the SIU can only serve to further undermine confidence in the special investigations unit's ability to conduct investigations.

According to press reports, the director of the SIU will hire civilians to participate in investigations even if the civilians never reach the level of trained police officers. How this will enable the SIU to conduct better investigations is really a mystery.

One of the most important recommendations of the Race Relations and Policing Task Force was the creation of a body that would conduct investigations within a 30-day time frame. Both Stephen Lewis and Clare Lewis recognized that this would require the use of experienced investigators, likely former police officers.

What the SIU now needs and has not been provided by this government is the resources to conduct independent and thorough investigations that will enjoy the confidence of both the police and the public.

1340

## GO RAIL EXPANSION

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I rose in the Legislative Assembly on May 5, 1993, to address the subject of the GO rail expansion program in the Richmond Hill corridor, which passes through my riding of Willowdale.

The expansion will increase the service from the current eight trains per day to a total of 34. These trains will literally be travelling through my constituents' backyards.

Those affected are concerned about the impact the expansion will have on their homes and about the Ministry of Environment and Energy's lack of consultation with the area residents.

On March 28 I wrote the Minister of Environment to request that an individual environmental assessment be conducted. Scores of individuals have written similar requests, yet to date the minister has ignored them.

This issue is of major concern to my constituents. On Monday, June 21, I attended an action meeting with several hundred area residents. There was general agreement among those in attendance that the need for public transportation must be recognized. However, the residents do not feel that their concerns about proper safety precautions, noise barriers and vibration damage were taken into consideration by GO Transit in their environmental assessment.

On behalf of my constituents, I repeat my request to the Minister of Environment that he agree to undertake

an individual environmental assessment that addresses and resolves my constituents' concerns. Minister, once again, I implore you to answer your mail.

## HERITAGE LEGISLATION

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** Tomorrow the Red and White People Parade will wind its way through downtown Kingston to Confederation Park across from city hall. As well as celebrate Canada's 126th birthday, this parade will honour Don Cherry, Doug Gilmour and Kirk Muller, all natives of the Kingston area, for their contributions to our national game.

This is only one of a number of varied activities celebrating Canada Day in my riding, but I single it out because it serves to highlight the importance of hockey to our national life. And I'm proud to say the Kingston area has played a prominent role in hockey history. For example, the first competitive game was played in Kingston in 1886 between Queen's and Royal Military College.

Just as July 1 is a day when we remind ourselves what it means to be Canadian, hockey has its own institutions to focus on its heritage. One of these is the International Hockey Hall of Fame Museum in Kingston, which is open every day to show visitors many aspects of hockey's fabled past.

Things like national holidays and the hockey museums demonstrate how important heritage is to our community.

Last August our government's Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Legislation made its recommendations. As chair of that committee, I know that the heritage community and other stakeholders as well were anxious to see new legislation introduced. I know too that members of the committee put in a lot of volunteer hours over the course of the year and their efforts developed a consensus on the recommendations, quite a feat considering the diverse interests around the table: archaeologists, ethnocultural communities and heritage activists.

So I was pleased to learn recently from the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation that her ministry has nearly completed draft heritage legislation based on the advisory committee's report. I'm pleased to hear too that she plans soon to circulate this draft for comment by the committee members and other stakeholders.

On the eve of Canada Day, I ask my legislative colleagues to reflect on the importance of committing ourselves to gain the all-party support that will ensure the passage of new heritage legislation this fall.

## SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** The saga continues. Yesterday I actually thought Mike Harris was going to listen to my advice when I said that bang, bang, bang was wrong and bad, bad, bad was the social contract



legislation. Now—can you believe it, Mr Speaker?—it seems that the Tories are still floundering when it comes to their position. The Conservative caucus is still trying to have it both ways.

I ask my Tory friends to stop the confusion, to be clear with the public and come clean. What is your position on the social contract?

First Mike Harris tells Bob Rae that he will support any legislation. That was bang, bang, bang. Then he says that legislation isn't needed at all. Then his caucus votes in favour of the legislation even though during second reading debate many members acknowledged the serious flaws and problems with this legislation. Now Mike Harris says he wants the social contract negotiations to continue for three years.

Mike Harris is adding to the chaos on the debate of the social contract. Mike, when will you realize that this legislation is fundamentally flawed? Lyn McLeod has explained the problem and shown you the flaws with the legislation, the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto has told you this is bad legislation, members of your own caucus have said it is seriously flawed, yet you seem to still support it.

I ask you to join the Liberal caucus and help us to defeat this bad legislation.

#### BOATING SAFETY

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** On June 2, I introduced a private member's bill aimed at increasing public awareness of the need for boater safety and education courses. As an avid boater myself, I know there is a need to educate the public that there is a real problem with careless and uninformed operation of motorboats on the province's waterways.

I recently met with Mr Sandy Currie, executive director of the Canadian Marine Manufacturers' Association, who indicated that he supports initiatives to educate people not acquainted with the rules of safe boating.

Mr Currie suggests those who want to achieve greater boating competence and confidence can call Canadian Power and Sail Squadrons at 1-800-268-3579 for information about the boating course. The manual is available for \$10.

Mr Currie notes that the Canadian Coast Guard's toll-free boating safety information hotline number, 1-800-267-6687, is available to provide a host of information to help maximize boater safety and peace of mind.

According to the statistics obtained from the Ministry of the Solicitor General, there were 43 boating accidents on Ontario waterways that resulted in deaths in 1992. There were 45 boating mishaps in 1991.

I applaud the Canadian Marine Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Power and Sail Squadrons and the Canadian Coast Guard for promoting boater safety and education. Like me, these organizations know

that recreational boating need not be dangerous, provided the operators acquire basic knowledge and take reasonable precautions, and this book is available for water safety.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS' HOUSING

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** On this last day of Senior Citizens' Month, I'd like to tell the House of the opportunity I had to celebrate with residents the official opening of Bethany Place, a non-profit housing project for seniors.

As you know, Mr Speaker, these projects don't happen without the dedication and support of sponsoring groups like Bethany Christian Residences of London, groups who know the needs in their communities. Without them, the non-profit program of the Ontario Ministry of Housing wouldn't be such a success, and many people, including seniors, wouldn't have secure, affordable housing.

Non-profit housing works, and it makes a difference in people's lives. It creates jobs—more than 40,000 in 1992—for workers in construction and other related industries. It's a lasting investment in our communities, and, most important, it creates affordable homes.

The importance of adequate, affordable housing cannot be overstated. Without it, everything else is more difficult. Caring for yourself, your family, getting an education, holding down a job, or finding one, or even safe, secure retirement—it's all harder if you don't have a home base to count on.

I'd like to congratulate board members for their hard work and their vision of housing for people in Middlesex and London and the community. I'd like to thank the Ministry of Housing for the support for those in need.

My very best wishes to the residents of Bethany Place for the many years of safe, secure and happy retirement ahead.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, the Honourable Joan Kirner, former Premier and current leader of the opposition party, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. She's joined by her husband, Ron Kirner. Welcome.

We are also joined this afternoon—seated in the Speaker's gallery is a delegation of former parliamentarians from Russia headed by Mr A. Nikolaev and Mr V. Novikov. Welcome to our chamber.

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to draw to your attention constituents of mine, Mr Sultan Jessa, his wife and daughter, seated in the Speaker's gallery. Sultan is one of the twelve 1993 recipients of the Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship, which will take place later this afternoon.

1350

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY  
AND RESPONSES  
CONTAMINATED SOIL**

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I'm very pleased to inform the members today about steps this government is taking to resolve a matter that has been discussed in this chamber many, many times. It is an issue that's very familiar to the members from the eastern part of Metro Toronto and it's of particular interest to the member for Scarborough North. I'm referring to the radioactive soil in Scarborough's Malvern community.

For far too long there has been a lot of talk but very little action on this situation. In fact, if just talking about it could have fixed this problem, then it would have happened long ago. But today I am pleased to announce that some dozen years after it was first discovered, soil contaminated with radioactive particles will be removed from the backyards of all 48 homes in the McClure Crescent area of Scarborough.

This government has pursued an active and thorough consultation with the local community spearheaded by a public liaison committee made up of area residents. The committee identified three possible sites where the treatment and temporary storage of excavated soil could take place, and the community endorsed those potential sites.

Today cabinet has approved the purchase of a site in the Tapscott industrial district, east of Tapscott Road and south of Passmore Avenue, the clear preference of the community.

I am happy to report that about 200 construction-related jobs will be created over the life of the project when excavation of the McClure soil begins this fall.

The soil will be transported to the Tapscott site and sorted to remove radium-coated plastic tubing and particles. This contaminated material will be sent to the federal government's facility in Chalk River and the resulting cleaner soil will be temporarily stored on the Tapscott site.

We have the technology to separate the soil like this. It was first demonstrated in the successful cleanup of similar soil at nearby McLevin Avenue. The soil remaining at McLevin will also be moved to the Tapscott site for storage.

This project demonstrates our government's commitment to ensure that people and communities have a right to a cleaner and safer environment.

At the end of the day, we'll have no more contaminated soil in Malvern. The McClure backyards will be restored and we'll have a temporary storage facility that's well away from where families live and children play.

I know this will be welcome news to the member for

Scarborough North and I commend him for his ongoing interest in this matter.

This government decided to solve a local problem locally, and with the community's help we're well on our way to doing just that.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** I too want to say it's a very important step in moving towards the final solution of this matter. The fact is that it is not yet over. I don't want the minister to feel complacent, to feel that we have done it all and here it is, that we have done a lot of work and there's no more to do.

The site that you have identified, as you know, is a temporary site and you await the federal government now to find its site to move it to. I hope this government does not sit on its laurels and not do anything.

I know the residents of the community, the public liaison committee that has worked so hard on this and the residents of the community who are concerned are pretty happy about this small move. I don't want to demean it in any way, but you must understand that when the Tories were in power they were wrestling with this large issue and couldn't get anywhere with it.

When the Liberals came in, as you know, those 48 homes were purchased by the government and transportation was paid for to resettle these people. It was a huge move to do that. Now this government did not slacken off in any way. They moved on, they continued with the liaison committee, they set up the office in the Malvern Centre and they continued to have this move. We know that the next move from the federal government is forthcoming, maybe in the next 10 years. I think it's a welcome announcement in that respect.

I remember George Heighinton, who was a strong advocate in that group to get this thing moving, received one of Canada's 125th anniversary commemorative medals for his efforts towards this. I'm not sure that he is very happy yet. He as an individual, like the constituency and the residents there, is waiting until all the soil is moved.

I think the event of the day that interrupted our party as government would have moved this thing much quicker. I want to say that it takes a lot of cooperation around the cabinet table. The former Minister of the Environment worked very, very hard at this, Jim Bradley from St Catharines, to make sure the things we were doing were environmentally sensitive, and of course many of his colleagues worked tremendously hard for this to happen.

I want to commend the minister for carrying on the cause, but I'm saying that it's not a lot of action you have done here. I know you can take the praise, and that's how the game is worked. We know you're in government now. You can take all the praise. It doesn't really matter. The people need, very much so, to feel at



home and settled within the environment, that there's no more radioactive soil around them.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** It's a good thing we have Alvin Curling to fight this.

**Mr Curling:** Yes. And I want to commend the people of Scarborough North for being so patient with me as I wrestled with the government and even my colleagues at the time to convince my present colleagues in the cabinet and the minister here to do that.

I want to say the battle's not over. The temporary site at Passmore is not sufficient. The federal Tories, who sat on their laurels all along and could not give you the permanent place for this, have impeded you enough, so you have taken this immediate position. I want to say we will be here and you will be here to let them talk to their cousins federally for the summer jobs. They have to do something and we hope that something will happen.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** Dealing with the statement, I would have hoped that the Minister of Environment and Energy would have also made a statement, when we are talking about the transportation of the soil, to make certain that it is being done in an environmentally safe way, so that all of the residents who have fought so long and hard for this will be assured that the goal they have striven for will be reached in the safest possible manner.

Certainly, I think we have to take a moment to congratulate the member for Scarborough North for the many years he has fought to make this happen. We know the residents around the area certainly are approving of this, but they are also very conscious that it must be done in the safest way possible to the environment.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I'd like to respond to the Chair of Management Board's comments with respect to this site. I would like to congratulate him initially on the consultation process. I thank him for having his staff go through with members of our caucus on the process that has been followed. There's no question that you have taken considerable time in working with the people of the area, trying to deal with a very difficult problem. Clearly, it appears that the government has worked with the local citizens and that there has been a certain amount of success. They have gained success with respect to that. There also has been some sort of confidence in the government in dealing with a very difficult problem.

I will say though, when I look at the statement, the wording of the statement is rather strange. I concur with my friends in the Liberal Party. It is strange that the Chair of Management Board—I understand why he's doing it, but this is strictly an environmental issue. Why in the world the Minister of Environment isn't making a statement on this whole process is beyond me, particularly when the statement by the Chair of Management

Board completely contradicts what the Minister of Environment and his predecessor have been saying since they came into office.

For example, "This government decided to solve a local problem locally." That's a lot of bunk. You're sending all this contaminated material up to Chalk River, and it gets back with the whole process. I'm not pointing to you, Mr Chair of Management Board, I point to the Minister of Environment on the whole issue of waste. Why won't you look at the long rail haul, sending garbage up to Kirkland Lake? You won't even look at that whole process.

1400

The other issue is that it's kind of amazing that you simply say, "We're now going to ensure that the people in communities have a right to a cleaner and safer environment." I'll be looking forward to hearing about how you solved all the pollution at the beaches this summer on Lake Ontario and how you're solving all the pollution that's been floating around this city, which was raised in this House yesterday. This statement is full of complete contradictions.

Although I congratulate the government with respect to the consultation process, it's not like the process in the IWA, in which there's been no consultation. It's a complete sham. The IWA, of course, has not worked in the same process. There is no confidence in this government. In fact, there's nothing but cynicism. I've never seen so many people, thousands of people from 57 sites, who have got upset with this government on its whole process from Bill 143 onwards in choosing, ultimately, three sites, three superdumps, that probably 50 years down the line are going to cause very serious problems.

This problem, I gather, started in the 1940s, albeit it certainly didn't come from a landfill site, but I don't think this government is looking at all the overall solutions: the overall solutions of the long rail haul and of incineration.

What this government is doing is creating three superdumps in the GTA. Does that mean that 50 years from now a Chair of Management Board is going to stand in his place and try to solve the same problems that were caused back in the 1940s? I doubt that very much. In fact, I doubt if the problem can be solved. It's a very serious problem that this government is doing.

Its boasting about how it's solving this problem is a bit of a sham, with the problem it's creating with the IWA and the sole issue of the three superdumps in the greater Toronto area. There's no plan with respect to the creation of the superdumps. They have no idea what it's going to cost and their planning in this whole process is absolutely a joke.

I must say that it makes me annoyed when I see this Malvern remedial project come forward and talk about the wonderful work it's doing, and yet they're creating

an even worse problem in the greater Toronto area with dumps that simply won't be solved. It's a prime example of incompetence. I would say that it's absolutely shameful that the government won't take the same type of consultation process, that it's boasted about in the Malvern remedial project, with the IWA. They've done absolutely nothing as far as gaining the confidence of the people of this province is concerned.

I would hope that the Malvern example, the problem that has occurred with the Malvern example, would be a prime reason why this government should stand back and take a long look at what it's doing in the greater Toronto area with the creation of the three superdumps.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Minister of Finance. As you are well aware, the Premier over the last few weeks has tried to portray anybody who is opposed to Bill 48 as being opposed to restraint. You will also be aware that yesterday the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto told us that it opposes Bill 48 because it will not succeed in reaching your goals of restraint. In fact, as the Metro board of trade has recognized, your Bill 48 is only going to defer some very significant costs to some time in the future and to some future government.

This is an issue which we have consistently raised, this issue of deferred costs, including the special leave provisions of Bill 48, under which unpaid leave for an essential service category much be repaid after 1996. We believe that provision alone could mean a deferral of up to \$3 billion in costs.

The Premier has refused to acknowledge that this is even an issue, and I ask you today, as Minister of Finance for the province of Ontario, will you not acknowledge that Bill 48 is only going to defer significant costs to some time in the future, and that in fact you have not even added up what those total deferred costs are going to be?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Perhaps I would agree with the leader of the official opposition in one sense and disagree with the Premier at the same time, that it is an issue but it's not a problem.

To use the number \$3 billion in deferred costs would imply that 50% of the entire savings in the public sector is tied up with the deferment of essential service jobs that would not be honoured during the next three years. I think that really is an exaggerated proposal. To imply that I think is simply not fair.

Secondly, the—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** You know, you know.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** In response to the member for

Bruce who thinks I know everything when really I don't—

**Mr Elston:** You're spot on.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Floyd, you're so modest.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Well, I really don't and—

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Time's awastin'.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm trying to answer the leader of the official opposition, but her own colleagues are interjecting in a way that makes it very difficult for me to focus on the very important question she asked.

I should remind the leader of the official opposition that after the three years of the social contract have expired, the days that still must be taken by those in the crucial service areas, or critical areas of service, cannot be taken in compensation. So there's no doubt in my mind but that arrangements will be made following that period of time to make sure there isn't a bubble of compensation that will cost the public sector at that point.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** That's nonsense.

**Mrs McLeod:** Minister, my colleagues are saying that's nonsense. I have to tell you that quite frankly, I find that completely irresponsible. If you are acknowledging today that this is an issue, how can you say that it is not a problem if you are agreeing that there is a commitment to deferred costs and that you have not even added up what those costs are likely to be?

We keep raising the issue. We keep saying, what is the deferred cost? At least today we have you acknowledging that there is a commitment by law to a cost that some future government is going to pay, and in the name of responsibility, you should be prepared to give us the answer to how much that cost is going to be.

Minister, I would raise another issue of what we believe to be less than responsible financial management in Bill 48. The Metro board of trade again warned that Bill 48 will allow the government to pursue its ideological agenda of eliminating the private sector from providing services on a contract basis to this government.

We have already seen what has happened in health care, where your government is intent on squeezing out the private sector home health care providers at a cost of over 10,000 jobs, not to mention the taxes those businesses now pay. Quite clearly, your government is proceeding with replacing private sector health care services with publicly run services, even though it will cost government more.

Last week, we raised the concern over the contracted garbage services which are now included under Bill 48, and that is another example of this government trying to



squeeze out the private sector. The Metro board of trade has said that such provisions have no place in legislation which is intended to reduce the public sector wage bill.

Minister, I ask: Surely you don't believe that squeezing the private sector out of all public services is somehow going to make government more efficient. Do you not understand that this legislation will not achieve your goals of restraint, but is only going to drive up the cost of public service?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I am going to respond to the first part of the leader of the official opposition's supplementary, because she chose to continue with her first question in the beginning of her supplementary, and that had to do with the creation of extra costs at the end of the three-year social contract time frame.

What the legislation says is that for those areas of critical service, if the 12 days per year cannot be achieved during this three-year period, they can be negotiated at a subsequent time period and cannot be taken in the form of compensation. Now, if that doesn't tell you that it's not creating a bubble of costs after the social contract has expired, then I don't know what does. If the leader of the official opposition wants to ask her second question again, I'll deal with that as well.

1410

**Mrs McLeod:** We have raised that question over and over. The wording of the legislation seems very clear to us and I wish, before this passes, because this government is going to force it through, that we could get a clear answer from this government on this issue. I would say again to this Treasurer that this is not a bill that stands in the name of financial restraint. This is a continuation of chaotic financial mismanagement by this government.

I would say again that I believe and have believed from the beginning that you can have restraint without chaos. We have been telling you for two and a half months now that you have two responsibilities: One is to set your financial targets, and the other is to negotiate with your own employees to achieve your targets and to give other public sector employers and employees the tools they need to do the same thing.

I say to you today that this legislation is so badly flawed that it cannot be amended. I ask you, in the name of financial restraint, will you not withdraw this legislation and now provide some leadership that works?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It should be a surprise to no one in the province of Ontario that the leader of the official opposition does not recognize restraint when she sees it. When her government was in office between 1985 and 1990, when there were record revenues in the province through natural growth in the economy, when there were record tax increases, it still allowed the debt of this province to increase by 33%. I can understand

why she doesn't understand this is a fiscal restraint package.

Finally, she also doesn't seem to understand that what we're doing is attempting to negotiate with our employees to arrive at a solution they agree with, that we as employer agree with, all in the interest of reducing public sector compensation in this province by \$2 billion.

If the leader of the official opposition says that her answer to fiscal restraint in this province is to withdraw this bill, that her answer to fiscal restraint is no more tax increases, that her answer to fiscal restraint is no expenditure reductions and that her answer to fiscal restraint is also to get the deficit down, then she's going to have to tell me what language she's speaking or what she's smoking.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mrs McLeod:** I understand why in this place the government is not prepared to respond to the opposition questions. Maybe outside the House he'll explain to the Metro board of trade why its concerns should not be taken seriously by this government.

#### RACE RELATIONS

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is to the Attorney General. We have all been disturbed and dismayed by the rash of hate crimes we have seen recently. I felt the distress of people who are victims of these kinds of crimes when I visited the shop of a Jewish merchant in Kitchener recently, a shop which had just recently been vandalized. I think probably almost every member of this House can point to a situation or a case in his or her riding which underlies a truly startling increase in racially motivated crime.

As legislators, we all believe that we have a special responsibility to do what we can to prevent these kinds of acts. That is why, quite frankly, I find it disturbing to read that officials of the Attorney General's ministry have expressed some hesitation in proceeding with prosecuting in these situations even when charges have been laid.

It is perhaps even more disturbing to read that you seem to believe that it can be hard to prove whether or not hatred has been wilfully promoted. I ask, do you not understand that any hesitation on your part will undermine the confidence of the police and prosecutors as they pursue these types of crimes? I ask what actions you're prepared to take to ensure that your officials will act in these kinds of situations.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I certainly agree with the opposition leader that all of us in this Legislature are very concerned about the kinds of issues she raises. But she's put two things together, and I think we need to be very clear about that.

The kinds of crimes, the beatings, the vandalism, the kinds of robberies that appear to have some connection

with racially motivated crime, are being vigorously pursued by the police. In fact, we daily see the accounts of the arrests that have been made and the efforts to prosecute for those crimes.

Part of the problem is that we do not yet have a capacity within the Criminal Code to have racial motivation as an aggravating factor in those crimes. That is something all the attorneys general are working together with the federal government to try to accomplish. I have said in this Legislature before that I really support that effort, because I think when there is a racial motivation to any kind of crime, it ought to be open to the court to name that as part of the issue and to take account of that in the sentencing.

The one area that is of concern is a section of the Criminal Code that does indeed talk about the wilful spreading of hatred. It is a difficult area to prosecute, as I'm sure the opposition understands. The law has been there for 22 years and there have been very few charges that have been laid.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I have said in this House very clearly that if charges are laid by the police—and police should be investigating and doing their work exactly as they would in any other suspected crime—if they have reasonable and probable grounds and lay the charge, we will certainly consider that very seriously. But we also need to be very clear that in these cases they are difficult to prove, given the wording of the law, and we need to be sure—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** —that we have a very good reason to prosecute, or else we might be liable for malicious prosecution.

**Mrs McLeod:** Minister, I do believe that there are steps that you can personally take to ensure that charges are laid in cases of racially motivated and hate crimes and that they are brought to prosecution. I am pleased to hear you say, as you have said in the past, that you believe this to be your responsibility. I would like to call on you today to carry out this responsibility and to make your views very clearly known both to police and to prosecutors.

You and the Solicitor General have the power to issue a directive to the police and to prosecutors that cases of racially motivated crimes should be investigated, that charges should be laid and that the charges should be prosecuted where warranted. I ask, will you commit to issuing such a directive in conjunction with the Solicitor General as soon as possible and in as clear a manner as possible?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** Indeed, at the cabinet round table on anti-racism that we have also talked about in this

Legislature before, both the Solicitor General and I indicated to the round table that this was certainly our intention. We have arranged some very strong consultations so that the message is clear and is doubly heard from both our ministries. It is one way in which we can reassure those who have unfortunately taken the wrong message from some of the public statements of some of the advocacy groups. We are not reluctant to move in these cases. We must move, however, according to the law as it stands.

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes, indeed there has been talk about the cabinet round table on anti-racism. There's also recognition that that round table has only met once.

In raising the issue of a directive, I would bring to the minister's attention that there is a precedent for such a directive, as the previous Attorney General also acted—not in conjunction with the Solicitor General but because he was also Solicitor General at the time—to issue such a directive in cases dealing with domestic assault.

Minister, I know you understand that this situation is reaching what I would consider to be critical proportions, that people in this province are becoming more and more alarmed and that there is need for very immediate action.

I ask, will you not deal with this as a crisis situation? Will you not look immediately at what other steps you and your government can be taking to deal with this problem? Perhaps you personally, might begin not just with the directive but with making very clear what the changes are in the Criminal Code which you believe are necessary in order to take that kind of effective and decisive action.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I can assure the member opposite that that is certainly what I have been doing and what I intend to do. I do not think it is wise for us to act precipitately without being very clear about how the directive can best be worded, and that's why it's taking a little time. We want to be sure that we are giving the kind of reassurance to police officers and to crowns that they need about how to proceed, and we will move as quickly as we can on that. There are in fact some directives that are already available to them and we need to work to strengthen those.

In terms of the Criminal Code, we are working, through the federal-provincial-territorial means, with our colleagues from other provinces to make some of the suggestions to the federal government about changes that need to be made. We have made suggestions in the past and will continue to do so. In particular, our colleagues in Quebec and in British Columbia and in Manitoba have expressed similar kinds of concerns. There is a working group that will be meeting through the summer, and we expect at our fall meeting of the ministers of justice to be able to take decisive action.



1420

## TAX INCREASES

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** My question is for the Minister of Finance. Tomorrow won't be just another Canada Day for the working people of Ontario. In fact, when people get up tomorrow morning, they will feel robbed and broke and demoralized because of the tax grab that begins on July 1 that you announced just over a month ago.

Tomorrow is Black Thursday. Instead of being celebrated as Canada Day, it's Black Thursday for what you've done to the people of the province of Ontario. Tomorrow's the day when you dip into the pockets of working Ontarians and take more money than any other government has taken from them ever in the history of this province. There isn't a person working in Ontario who, tomorrow, won't start to feel the impact of your punitive, draconian, mean-minded budget of last May. Everyone in this province who is trying to make a living and do something is going to be impacted by your budget.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the member place a question.

**Mr Cousens:** What do you have to say to the thousands of families who have no choice but to do with less money?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** In response to the question from the member for Markham, I would simply say that I understand that no one likes to pay more taxes—that's obvious—and I appreciate the fact that people will feel it in their paycheques starting on July 1. At the same time, I hope people, when they think about it and when they feel that impact, will understand that this was not simply a year in which we decided to have a big tax increase.

We decided we would reduce expenditures very substantially across the province, and we looked at the commitments made for 1993-94 and reduced our expenditures by about \$4 billion. We then looked at compensation of the public sector and reducing that by \$2 billion. The third component in order to get our financial house in order was the very aggressive tax increases which start tomorrow.

I acknowledge that it's quite a substantial tax increase. I would simply ask him, as a member of the Conservative caucus, to harken back to 1981-82 when his government increased provincial income tax by four points in that year. It's not as though we're setting any particular precedent here, although I do acknowledge the fact that this is an aggressive tax package.

**Mr Cousens:** You still don't face up to the hardship that you're creating for the people who are trying to make Ontario come alive: the entrepreneurs, the families, the working people who are trying to make a success of themselves; the fact that your budget, more

than any other single factor, will take jobs away and cause deep, deep hurt to the people of Ontario.

If a family has less to spend, then they won't be going out to eat at the local restaurant, they won't be buying that new car or appliance this year, they won't be calling on the local contractor for renovation work. What makes you think that your tax-and-spend plan will help Ontario when you're clearly strangling our economy?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** First of all, I wish he'd put it in perspective that if we're going to have a healthy economy in this province and if we're going to be able to continue to have the same kind of living standard we've enjoyed in the past, we have to first of all get our financial house in order. I'm not pointing fingers in that regard, but we've simply got to do that. The result of the recession has truly been devastating on our revenues and we've got to do something about that.

I will point fingers a little bit in this regard, in that when the member for Markham talks about costing jobs, I would ask him to cast his eyes to Ottawa and ask himself whether or not anything we've done could even compare to what the federal government has done with its free trade agreement and its GST.

**Mr Cousens:** Cast your own eyes to Ottawa. Your Premier is invited to a meeting, and you don't even care about the rest of the country or anything else; he won't even go.

Come on, we're in Ontario, we're part of Canada. We want to see Canada strong, we want to see Ontario strong, and what you're doing is burying us.

Here we have another 4,000 more petitions from the people of Ontario saying to you that they're upset. It's the tip of the iceberg. Once people wake up tomorrow morning, they're going to realize just how rotten a government they've got, that the thieves at Queen's Park have robbed them blind.

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Cousens:** Where's my question? How can you justify this job-killing investment that you're calling a tax? How can you justify this to the people of Ontario who are trying to make a living? Tell me.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I really do believe that if the government had simply brought in a very large tax increase without doing what we're doing on the expenditure side, we would be open for criticism and I would be standing up and agreeing with the member for Markham. But for him to imply that this is simply a tax increase without us doing a lot of other things, very difficult things, on the expenditure side—it is simply not fair not to approach this in a fairminded way.

For the member for Markham to imply that we could address some of the economic problems of this country by taking part in a photo opportunity with the new

Prime Minister in Vancouver really is stretching the cloth a bit.

**The Speaker:** On a point of order, the member for Scarborough North.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** Mr Speaker, on a point of being politically correct, I just wonder if the member for Markham could define for me what "Black Thursday" is.

**The Speaker:** The member raises a point of order. I would allow the member for Markham an opportunity to respond to his colleague.

There is no response.

#### FIRST MINISTERS' MEETING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I have a question for the Deputy Premier. Are you, as Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance, not at all concerned that Ontario will be the only province not represented at the first ministers' meeting this weekend?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** No. I think the Premier had served notice some time before the invitation was even extended that he was not going to be taking part in a conference on the eve of a federal election. Surely, the member for Parry Sound, who has been in political life for some time now, understands that on the eve of a federal election, without a mandate to effect any substantial reform of any of the agreements between the federal government and the provinces, absolutely nothing useful will flow from that meeting in Vancouver, absolutely nothing. I would say to the member for Parry Sound that I believe the Premier has made a wise and judicious decision.

**Mr Eves:** The Premier has been quoted as saying, and the Treasurer just said it again, that this is nothing more than a photo op. I would like to ask the Deputy Premier how it can be a photo op when no self-respecting first ministers would want their pictures taken with Bob Rae?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Perhaps you could ask Prime Minister Campbell that, who's pleading with him to go. Don't ask me that question. She's the one. It's the Prime Minister who wants the Premier to go.

**Mr Eves:** The Premier's refusal to attend this first ministers' meeting, the only first minister in Canada to do so—I guess the others are all idiots or wrong, then; I guess that's what Bob Rae is saying.

It's quite obvious. Talk about playing politics. His refusal to go is simply playing politics a few months before the next federal election. Is partisan politics more important to Bob Rae, I ask the Deputy Premier, than putting forward his government's economic plan within this country of Canada and giving some information to the Prime Minister of Canada for our relationship among the G-7 countries? Is that more important, to play politics? That's exactly what you're doing with the

issue. You know that. Every other first minister in the country's going to be there and yours isn't. Are they all nuts or are you nuts?

1430

**Hon Mr Laughren:** In response to the potential federal member from Parry Sound, I would simply say that I believe that all the premiers will make their own judgement in this regard. I don't think that anybody's nuts or crazy if they decide to go or not go. They have to exercise their own best judgement. But I can tell you that the federal government has known for a long time what our political and economic agenda is for the province of Ontario. They have chosen to ignore it, and for the member for Parry Sound to imply that suddenly now, on the eve of a federal election, the federal Tory party is going to start listening to Ontario's demands at the table, I think is truly fanciful. If anybody's playing politics with this issue, it's not the Premier of Ontario; it's the member for Parry Sound and the Prime Minister of Canada.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My question is to the Treasurer, and I come at it from a different angle because I'm not there to protect the Conservative Party federally or anything. But I know that a couple of weeks ago the Treasurer felt it was important enough for himself to attend, along with the other ministers, a federal-provincial conference of ministers of finance of Canada and that he was there to represent the views of the government of the province of Ontario and the people of this province.

Mr Treasurer, your friend the Premier was critical of those who saw fit to leave the negotiating table during the social contract talks, yet the Premier himself will not even go to the table when the federal ministers and the provincial ministers are there.

Would the minister not agree with me that the Premier of this province should comply with the overwhelming wishes of the people of this country to put aside the partisan bickering between federal and provincial governments and join all of the other premiers and the federal Prime Minister to discuss the important economic questions confronting this question and that, in doing so, the Premier would not appear to be petty? We all know the Premier isn't petty, but he would dispel this feeling that he was just being a petty politician.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** There really is a big difference between this meeting that's been called by the federal Prime Minister and the meetings that have been held on an ongoing basis among the finance ministers of Canada. There were all sorts of agenda items that had to be completed and matters to be discussed on which we'd already started work. I don't believe for a moment that the time that's been set aside in Vancouver for the federal Prime Minister and the premiers to meet was



going to be adequate time at all to deal with any matters of substance. Really, the petty politics are not emanating from this province or from this Premier. If anything, they're emanating from the Prime Minister of Canada.

**Mr Bradley:** I think the Treasurer would agree with me about this concern about a photo opportunity that our friend the Premier has never been known to be a person to shy away from a photo opportunity. In fact, I have seen him during Hockey Night in Canada beside Steve Stavro giving the thumbs-up sign and wearing the Maple Leafs badge. I'm sure he was there just to cheer for the Maple Leafs and not for a photo opportunity, but our Premier is noted for having some of the sharpest elbows in the country when it comes to a television camera within 20 feet. So I don't think that's a concern.

What I want to ask the Treasurer, however, is the following: Does the Treasurer not believe that this action on the part of the Premier sets a rather unfortunate precedent in that in the final year of the Premier's mandate we could see circumstances where a federal government might say, "We're not going to invite Ontario to the federal-provincial conference of premiers because the Premier of Ontario is about to go into a provincial election"? Does he not think that that would be rather dangerous as a precedent and that it would in the long term not be in the interests of the people of Ontario, and would he not now persuade the Premier to change his mind, to join this team effort of all the premiers, including two New Democrats, to try to confront the financial problems in this country?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm sure an NDP federal government would not do that, to start with.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** We will never know, will we?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Never mind, never mind.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I appreciate the interjections, Mr Speaker.

I don't believe the analogy is an appropriate one. The Premier said a long time ago that, with the election perhaps weeks away, nothing substantial was going to happen at a first ministers' conference at this time. I can't imagine what they're going to do in the limited number of hours available to them that could have any impact on either federal-provincial negotiations or on the economy of this province.

The federal government has had lots of opportunity to respond to our demand that we be treated differently when it comes to the transfer payments that are owing to this province and it has chosen not to respond in a positive way.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I have a question of the Deputy Premier as well. Approximately

three weeks ago, before our new Prime Minister was elected to that position by the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, there was a meeting in Vancouver of all the trade ministers from across this country. That was in Vancouver as well. Can you tell me why there were only two provinces that were not represented by their ministers at that particular meeting, one being Saskatchewan, an NDP government, and the other being Ontario?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** No, I cannot answer that question. I just assume there were other commitments that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade had. So I cannot answer the question.

**Mr Sterling:** That particular meeting dealt with dropping trade barriers across this country so that people would have the opportunity of crossing borders to work and have the opportunity of trading across the borders.

The question comes to mind to the Deputy Premier: Is your government more interested in being involved in the federal election than it is in maintaining the interests of the people of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Hardly. I believe the member for Carleton knows full well that the Premier has spoken many, many times on the way in which this province has been treated by the present federal government. He knows full well that no one has been more outspoken in the interests of this province than this Premier has been, and it's been particularly difficult with the federal Tories in office in Ottawa.

#### ROUGE VALLEY

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Everyone will know that we have announced the expansion of the Rouge and the park that will be created in that area, and it's been announced on more than one occasion by Pauline Browes, the Tory member in Scarborough, that we would be getting \$10 million. Now that she is the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, can we expect that the Tories will stop turning their backs on their promises and start delivering on this \$10 million?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** I know this is an important question for all of those people who live in the eastern part of Metro Toronto and in the Durham region generally.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** The place you are going to put a dump in, Howie. It's very important because you are going to put a dump there.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Willowdale.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** The federal government has announced on a couple of occasions, and has indicated otherwise on a couple of occasions, that it is interested

in making a contribution to the Rouge Valley Park, and in fact, spokespersons for the federal government have indicated that they would be prepared to make a \$10-million contribution to the park.

1440

I have had a meeting with the federal MP for Scarborough Centre, who is now the Minister of Indian Affairs in the federal government, and we are hopeful that the federal government will soon come forward with the \$10-million commitment. It would indeed be a meaningful contribution to the park, and we're very hopeful that they will live up to the statements that they have made over the past six or seven months.

**Mr Wiseman:** My supplementary concerns the federal government's ownership of the land in north Pickering that was expropriated 20 years or so ago from the residents to create the Pickering airport. The question deals with the land that is in the northwestern section of the provincial preserve, which is abutting the southwestern section of the federal preserve, which is at a crucial link between two river systems that is necessary to create an ecosystem or a corridor between those two so that there could be a natural wildlife corridor.

My question to the Minister of Natural Resources: Have we got any commitment from the federal government that they will do as they did in British Columbia and create a large wildlife reserve corridor between these two sections so that we can preserve the natural habitat in the north end of Pickering and in the section of Markham?

**Hon Mr Hampton:** The member is quite correct: The federal government owns a great deal of land which is immediately adjacent to the land which the provincial government has set aside for the Rouge River park. We have indicated to the federal government that if they were to add some of this land to what has already been set aside by the province for the park, this would indeed create a park which would be a leading example of an urban park for all of North America. We have impressed this upon the federal government. We are hopeful that they will act soon, again, to live up to some of the statements that they've made in the past.

#### JOBS ONTARIO TRAINING FUND

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Minister of Education and Training. Minister, your ministry plans to spend some \$339 million on your Jobs Ontario Training program this year, and I believe that the people of this province have a right to expect that the huge sums of money that you are pouring into the Jobs Ontario Training program are in fact spent properly.

I'm sure you are very much aware that serious problems have come to light with the spending of Jobs Ontario Training funds through the broker in Brantford, and indeed I have a copy of the letter that was dated

June 1 that was signed by the assistant deputy minister of Jobs Ontario Training, Joan Andrew. The letter confirms that Jobs Ontario Training officials are now admitting an operating loss of some \$640,000 by the Brantford broker. The letter also outlines a deep concern about the lack of management and financial control over the expenditure of public funds through the Brantford brokerage.

Minister, I understand that this particular situation is under investigation. My question today is not about the Brantford situation. Our concern is that this may in fact be the tip of an iceberg. I ask you today: What steps had you put in place prior to the Brantford problem coming to light to ensure that the Jobs Ontario Training funds were being properly spent by brokers on the Jobs Ontario Training program?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I appreciate the question from the Leader of the Opposition, and I think it's important to understand that the way the concerns at the Brantford broker's office came to light was through our regular auditing of the broker. That's the way this whole issue came to light. It didn't come any other way; it was through our regular monitoring of the broker. When that occurred, then we went through the next steps. As you know, we've moved in, we're now actually running that particular broker with people from I believe the ministry, but we're supervising it directly.

So, yes, we take it very seriously. There are a lot of brokers right across the province, so it's a massive job, but we're regularly looking at each of the brokers. I think it's a credit to the service that we're the ones who discovered the problems through our auditing, and then the further investigations continued.

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** Minister, you have said that you do regular auditing and monitoring through Jobs Ontario Training. But the truth is, before this Brantford instance came to light in February, this was not true and you were not doing this across the province. In fact, Minister, when I went to a briefing in your very office with your staff and Jobs Ontario employees, I asked the specific question of what was being done for accountability and to ensure it was being done. At that stage, that was one month after you were being briefed about the Brantford incident. Your ministry officials said to me, "No, we have regularly monitored," but you did not have it prior to the Brantford incident.

Why don't you admit that this program was done in such haste and was politically motivated and that a year after this program was announced, you still did not have any accountability mechanism in place to ensure that Jobs Ontario brokers were spending the money on Jobs Ontario Training programs?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I don't know how to answer a question from an opposition member who says, "You



don't have any monitoring in place," when I just said that it was because of our regular monitoring, through the auditing that we do with the brokers, that we discovered the problem. This wasn't something that the member for Eglinton discovered and reported to the government. This is something we discovered because we're concerned that public money is spent wisely.

Now, when we've got a lot of brokers involved and thousands of jobs being created across the province and thousands of employers involved, then obviously there are going to be instances where there will be some difficulties. When those instances are discovered, it's our responsibility to get them investigated. As the member knows, the case in Brantford has been reported and is being investigated by the OPP. So it's being dealt with appropriately, aggressively, and I think to the credit of the ministry.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Minister, are you aware of the fact that when casino gambling was introduced into the state of New Jersey, horse racing attendance and wagering fell by a third? What steps are you taking to make sure the same thing doesn't happen here in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** We have looked at many studies associated with casino gambling and horse racing, and there are different results in different studies, depending on certain circumstances. At this point in time, we are talking about one casino, a pilot project in Windsor, and we are working very closely with the track in that area, which has been experiencing some difficulty for a while. We'll be working closely with them to see if there are some ways the new casino and the track can work together to draw patrons.

**Mr Eves:** Lotteries, sports betting and now casino gambling are taking increasingly larger slices out of what was a very viable industry in the province of Ontario. At the same time, the parimutuel tax in the province of Ontario is the highest in North America, with the only exception being the California thoroughbred racing program. At 5%, your parimutuel tax is exactly 900% higher than it is in the state of New Jersey, which is 0.5%, and where they also have casino gambling, by the way.

You need to create a level playing field here in the province of Ontario. Will you make a commitment that you will lower that tax to give the horse racing industry in the province of Ontario a chance to succeed?

**Hon Ms Churley:** It's impossible to take at face value all of the statistics that come in around the levels of taxation, because in many of the states in the United States there are hidden costs that the industry has to pay for, which I'd be happy to share with the member later.

**Mr Eves:** You're the minister. You're supposed to know this stuff.

**Hon Ms Churley:** But certainly we have been working with the horse racing industry because it has suffered somewhat as a result of the recession—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Parry Sound.

1450

**Hon Ms Churley:** As the member knows, if he would like to hear the answer, the government—

**Mr Eves:** I have a question for you, David. Is it open today and will it be open six months from now?

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Parry Sound, please come to order.

**Hon Ms Churley:** The member did not listen to one word of my answer and I really don't think he is interested in hearing the answer. So I would be happy to speak privately later with anybody who would like to listen.

**The Speaker:** New question, the member for Peterborough.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** This question is for the minister responsible for automobile insurance—

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—I did try to do it before the member had started her question—I would like to give the House notice that I will be filing a notice of dissatisfaction with the Minister of Education's answer.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** If all members would file their dissatisfaction outside of question period.

**Ms Carter:** This question is for the minister responsible for automobile insurance reform. Many seniors in my riding of Peterborough, many of whom are on fixed incomes, have raised concerns about premium increases that will result from Bill 164, An Act to amend the Insurance Act. Can the minister tell this House what impact Bill 164 will have on the cost of automobile insurance and how this will affect seniors in my riding?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet and Government House Leader):** I thank the member for Peterborough for her question. It's a timely one, because, as members will know, during the debate on Bill 164 the insurance industry started with wild predictions of 25% increases in rates, then they were 20%, then they were 15%, then they were 12%.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** Is that as wild as your no-fault public automobile insurance?

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Burlington South.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Members may be interested in having noticed an interview with Cliff Fraser, the regional vice-president of State Farm Insurance, in Thompson's World Insurance News the other day, where Mr Fraser now applauds the whole process around Bill 164 and admits, even from the industry's perspective, that the increases associated with Bill 164 from the insurance industry's perspective will be between 6% and 7%.

We still stick to the original comment that we made about Bill 164, that the costs associated at maximum will be between 3% and 4%.

**Ms Carter:** I'd also like to raise the issue of the classification system for drivers and its impact on low-risk drivers. Many seniors have driven for many years without accidents. Can the minister tell us whether Bill 164 will penalize drivers who have long records of safe driving?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Bill 164 basically gives to the government the authority to move in the future to deal with the classification system, and we intend to do that after sitting down with the industry and redesigning the classification system.

But specifically with respect to drivers who have good driving records, it is the intention of reform in the classification system to make bad drivers pay for the problems in the system, to reward good drivers across the system, so that good drivers, whether they're 18, 47 or 72, and bad drivers, whether they're 18, 47 or 72, are in fact dealt with equally and appropriately.

#### TENDERING PROCESS

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation, who is getting ready to give one of his famous answers. Last week the Premier announced that two private consortia are being formed to prepare bids to finance and build Highway 407. The Premier also said that these two groups will get \$1.5 million each to prepare their submission.

The public wants the 407 built and would like it built as soon as possible, and if that involves the private sector, I think that's great, that's good. But the public also wants to be assured that its hard-earned tax money is being spent wisely and well. Minister, why is the Ontario government paying \$3 million to the private companies so that they can prepare a bid for a government contract?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** The question is valid indeed. The sentiment, the element of competition in the marketplace is alive and well because the two consortiums represent fully 80% of active transportation players, people who are building in the province of Ontario.

The responsibility and the obligation of the government are to make sure that the taxpayers get value for money. Each consortium will be getting \$1.5 million,

but they will put in much more money in order to arrive at their specs. But competition is alive and well. We see it as the essence, that element in the marketplace, and it should ensure that the taxpayers get a fair shake.

It will also mean that for the first time the free-enterprise system is involved at the infrastructure level, right at the beginning, so they can bid on a bigger piece of the action. The bigger the piece of the pie, the more savings for the taxpayers and better value for money.

**Mr Daigeler:** As I indicated, I am all-supportive of the fact to have the private sector putting forward some ideas and being involved in this project, but so far all you have really said is that the government is putting out money so the private sector can prepare its bid. I'm not really assured at all that the taxpayers' money is well accounted for, and in particular after the issue that was just raised during this question period by my leader, when we know that Jobs Ontario money apparently seems to have been misdirected in Brantford.

Can you assure me and this House and the Ontario public that the whole bidding process and the eventual awarding of contracts surrounding the 407 will be open for the closest public scrutiny and for intense examination by this Legislature?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** Absolutely. We have an obligation to make sure that everything is aboveboard. But to go back to the essence of the question, 26,000 direct jobs: This government is putting the machine in drive. This project, that will be approximately \$3 million, will not be built in seven years but will be built faster so the jobs will take place faster. That's the crux of the matter. In terms of due process, you will find that this administration has nothing short of an immaculate record.

#### FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. July 1 is going to be the beginning of the end of the forest industry in Ontario. The employees and the employers are both going to suffer badly. This is the most damaging tax hike in the history of the province of Ontario. You have doubled both the area charges, which have gone from \$51 to \$102, and the stumpage fees, and this will kill hundreds of forestry jobs throughout eastern and northern Ontario. How do you justify a 100% tax increase on jobs in the forest industry?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** I wish that the member would not use language which, if I may, says that all is doom and gloom, because I think that if you look at what has happened in the area of lumber prices over the last year and a half and if you look at some of the other actions that have taken place in the last year, you would find that increases in stumpage fees are in fact in order.

All we have done is that we have equalized the base stumpage rate that sawmills pay so that it will now be



equal to the base rate which pulp and paper mills pay. While that may affect some individual producers, I have indicated in meetings with the lumber manufacturers that we will be prepared to work with individual producers to ensure that they have a period of adjustment. With respect to the area charges, the fact is that the changes in the area charges will contribute very little to the delivered cost of wood. In fact, the greatest portion of the delivered cost of wood comes from all the other factors.

Let me just say this: I want to ask the member where he was and where his party was when the current federal government hit all sawmill producers with a 15% export tax based on the final price of lumber.

1500

**Mr Jordan:** I have a letter from Canadian Pacific Forest Products Ltd. The total effect of these increases to CP Forest Products is expected to be in the range of \$2.2 million in 1993. This is probably conservative, as it is impossible to factor in additional costs of purchased wood attributable to the increased stumpage rates. I would expect the 1994 cost increase to be in the range of \$3.3 million. The company is stating very clearly that it cannot cope with that increase. If you needed it, it should have been phased in, not a 100% increase.

Here we are with the small, non-integrated loggers. Those are the ones that do not have a union, the non-integrated ones, the small business people, and they make only \$8 a cord on the wood.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jordan:** They make only \$8 a cord. He's increased it by \$10 a cord. How do you expect them to stay in business? There are 163—

**The Speaker:** Could the member please place a question.

**Mr Jordan:** This is my question. There are 163 employees in the minister's riding who will be out of work. I ask the minister, would he please, for the sake of the small, non-integrated loggers, remove that increase in the stumpage fee?

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Again, I would urge the member to take care in some of the figures that he's using. I too have seen the letter from Canadian Pacific Forest Products, which has at least two very large forest management areas. They also have a number of third parties that work on those forest management areas. It may be the case that if there is a \$2.2-million increase in costs, this \$2.2-million increase in costs will be shared among a number of operators. I think it's just going a bit overboard to say that somebody is going to have to pick up all of a large cost. The fact is that on those very large areas of forest land, many people are harvesting, many people are hauling. There are many third-party agreements.

Finally, let me say to the member that we acknowledge—I acknowledge—that based upon the business relationships that some individual operators have, they may have some difficulty. I have already indicated that we are prepared to work with those companies that are in a strained position. We have done this before by means of deferring stumpage fees. I would simply say that through the very difficult period over the last three years, we were able to work with sawmillers.

I wonder where the federal government has been through all of this. Nowhere have they been anywhere in sight helping those sawmills or those loggers.

**The Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I've sat patiently throughout question period and, prior to that, ministerial statement period, waiting for the Minister of Health to inform the House of her rather important flip-flop that she announced yesterday regarding user fees for seniors' drugs.

**The Speaker:** There's nothing out of order. The member knows full well what the standing order is with respect to ministerial statements. Petitions?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Point of privilege.

**The Speaker:** A point of privilege, on a new matter, I trust.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I feel that my privileges have been made null and void, and certainly abused, with respect to the fact that that government was elected on a sanctimonious platform with respect to no user fees in the health care system.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Would the energetic member for Simcoe West please take his seat.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** It sounds as if the member for Simcoe West indeed has material for a question for question period, and if there are more question periods, then indeed he may rise in his place and pose a question.

The member for Brant-Haldimand with his petition.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I'd ask for unanimous consent that I could place that question.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to revert to ministerial statements?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I hear at least one "nay."

## PETITIONS

### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition as follows:

"Your assault on the education of the children of our

province is intolerable. We ask that you immediately cease the social contract cutbacks and advance to the boards of Ontario the funding that they require."

This is signed by 882 separate school board teachers from the regional municipality of Waterloo.

A second petition with the exact same wording, petitioning as follows:

"Your assault on the education of the children of our province is intolerable. We ask that you immediately cease the social contract cutbacks and advance to the boards of Ontario the funding that they require."

That's signed by 2,163 teachers employed by the Waterloo county public school board.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** I have a petition here that's signed by over 100 names, which we have been receiving each day, 100 or so, and it's a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across the province,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"The government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

I have also signed this petition.

#### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Huron Regional Centre in Orillia, Ontario, is a facility providing housing, medical care and recreational/educational services to mentally handicapped, and in some cases also physically handicapped residents. These residents require 24-hour supervision and medical care.

"Parents and relatives of residents at Huronia Regional Centre are concerned about the process of staff cuts taking place and wish to ensure that the quality of care to residents does not decline as a result of a widening ratio of staff to residents. There is further concern that resident medical doctors are being cut from staff and/or retiring and not being replaced.

"We, the undersigned, being parents, relatives or friends of residents at the Huronia Regional Centre, Orillia, Ontario, respectfully request that the government

of Ontario impose no further staff cuts at this facility until such time as suitable alternative living arrangements are secured for the residents."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

#### CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food has decided to close Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the veterinary services diagnostic laboratory at the college as of May 1, 1994,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To reverse the decision to close the Centralia College of Agricultural Technology and the veterinary services laboratory located on Centralia's campus."

I have signed the petition.

1510

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I support this petition.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and



"Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 164 be withdrawn."

#### BRUCE GENERATING STATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly. I've presented several of these over the last several weeks. This will be the last presentation of petitions in relation to Bruce A and I would like to read the full petition.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"When discussing the future of Bruce A, to consider that the undersigned are in full support of the continued operation of all the units at Bruce A. Furthermore, we support the expenditure of the required money to rehabilitate the Bruce A units for the following reasons:

"In comparison to other forms of generation, nuclear energy is environmentally safe and cost-effective. Rehabilitating Bruce A units is expected to achieve \$2 billion in savings to the corporation over the station's lifetime. This power is needed for the province's future prosperity.

"A partial or complete closure of Bruce A will have severe negative impacts on the affected workers and will severely undermine the economy of the surrounding communities and the province.

"In addition to the undersigned, this petition is endorsed by the following municipal, business and labour groups:

"Councils: Bruce township, Huron township, Kincardine, Kincardine township, Owen Sound, Port Elgin, Ripley, Saugeen, Tiverton;

"Chambers of commerce: Kincardine, Port Elgin, Southampton;

Business associations: Kincardine, Port Elgin, Bruce County Realtors Association;

"Labour groups: CUPE 1000, the Society; Grey/Bruce Labour Council," and several other organizations;

"Riding associations: Bruce NDP, Bruce Provincial Liberal Association, Bruce provincial Progressive Conservatives;

"Bruce County School Board and Grey/Bruce Community Industrial Training Advisory Committee."

Well over 15,600 other people have signed this petition. I support the petition and have added my name.

#### PRODUCE-YOUR-OWN BEER AND WINE

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the undersigned, believe that your new tax on brew-on-premises home brew is unfair, unwanted

and unreasonable, we are concerned that it will eliminate jobs without increasing government revenue; and

"Whereas this new tax is inspired by big, multinational brewing corporations whose only desire is to keep us from enjoying home brew;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament to scrap the tax before it begins tomorrow."

That's signed by 240, and I affix my signature.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** As you know, Mr Speaker, the tradition of the House does not allow a minister to read a petition, so I am reading this petition on behalf of Brian Charlton.

"We, the undersigned, are concerned about the ramifications of passing Bill 164. It is our understanding that the bill will result in an increase in auto claims costs and therefore result in an average increase in insurance premiums of 20%.

"We are particularly concerned about the increase in rates for low-risk groups. Enough data has been collected to prove that women and senior citizens are in a low-risk group. We have fewer accidents and thus we make fewer claims. We do not feel it is fair for people in low-risk groups such as women and senior citizens to pay higher rates to subsidize the higher risk drivers.

"We would like Bill 164 to be stopped."

It's signed by a number of people in the Hamilton area.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, hereby request you to vote against the passing of Bill 38. We believe that this bill defies God's laws, violates the principle of religious freedom, reduces the quality of life, removes all legal protection to workers regarding when they must work, and will reduce rather than improve the prosperity of our province. The observance of Sunday as a non-working day was not invented by man but dates from God's creation and is an absolute necessity for the wellbeing of all people, both physically and spiritually. We beg you to defeat the passing of Bill 38."

It's signed by 54 residents of the Brant, Norfolk and Oxford areas. I have affixed my signature.

#### SENIORS' HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and the Lieutenant Governor:

"Whereas the NDP party have always stated that they were against user fees;

"Whereas the NDP party have now decided to renege on this position;

"Whereas the NDP party have decided to impose user fees on the drug plan for our senior citizens;

"Whereas our senior citizens feel cheated by the NDP government and find the promises of this government to be hypocritical, sanctimonious, absurd, and to absolutely fly in the face of anything they said in the last election;

"Therefore, we ask this government to resign, as they have lost the trust of the seniors of Ontario."

That's signed by the member for Carleton, Mr Sterling, by many of the members of my caucus and other good citizens in this province who still believe in principle and still believe that what you say in an election campaign is what you do after you're elected.

#### PAROLE SYSTEM

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition to present that's been sent to me by the women of Sandgate, a women's shelter in Georgina. They've done a remarkable job of collecting this petition. As you can see, it's been signed by thousands and thousands of people. I'll read this petition.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Brian Kavanagh will be eligible for parole on July 22, 1993, after serving only 20 months (one sixth) of his sentence, that this travesty of justice be addressed immediately by whatever means available and that are within your power to prevent the premature release of this person from custody.

"On January 31, 1991, Ellen Sands Kavanagh was stabbed 32 times in her back, hands, ear, eyes, cheek, neck, chest and stomach with a fishing knife; her head was bludgeoned twice with a 15-pound axe, fracturing her skull in three places and breaking her jaw. Her neck was slashed with a saw. Her estranged husband, Brian Kavanagh, was convicted of manslaughter in November 1991 and was sentenced to 10 years in a federal prison.

"On July 22, 1993, Brian Kavanagh comes before the National Parole Board. On that date he is eligible for unescorted temporary absence and day parole. He has already applied for a halfway house in the city of his choice and will only have to report between the hours of midnight and 6 am to that location. The victim's family lives in terror at the thought of his release. We, the undersigned, wish to loudly proclaim that:

"This is not our concept of Canadian justice."

After witnessing on the news last night the family speaking, I think they very much would like to see this supported. I know there are thousands of people who have signed this, and it certainly does send an overwhelming message to the government. I have signed my name to it.

#### SENIORS' HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas there is a grave concern about the recent proposals affecting the Ontario drug benefits program;

and

"Whereas this statement has caused a great deal of anger and frustration among the seniors of this province; and

"Whereas seniors do not prescribe their own medication and feel that the government should address the origin of the problem more carefully;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, are opposed to user fees for seniors' drugs and petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to accept the list of signatures on the attached document and request the government to work closely with seniors to develop an alternate plan."

This is signed by Doug Schnurr and Shelley MacKay, and actually covers a list of names which was not quite in proper form but includes Irene Dosman, Hilda Dustow and others from the Mildmay area who form part of a seniors' action committee designed to protect the integrity of programs that have been heretofore considered sacred trusts to the people of Ontario. I attach my signature to this petition.

#### 1520

#### PRODUCE-YOUR-OWN BEER AND WINE

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the undersigned, believe that your new tax on brew-on-premises home brew is unfair, unwanted and unreasonable, we are all concerned that it eliminates jobs without increasing government revenue; and

"Whereas the new tax is inspired by big multinational brewing corporations whose only desire is to keep us from enjoying home brew;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament to scrap the tax before it begins."

#### CHILD CARE

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** I'd like to present this petition on behalf of over 1,000 signatories, supporters of the Rainbow Village Childcare Centre.

"We, the undersigned, are board members, staff and parents of the Rainbow Village Childcare Centre. We feel it is unfair to assess a non-profit child care centre for property taxes. We feel that Rainbow Village Childcare Centre is a seminary of learning and should be exempted from property taxes."

I affix my signature of support.

#### SENIORS' HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have another petition that deals with the drug benefit program:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a grave concern about the recent proposals affecting the Ontario drug benefit program; and

"Whereas this statement has caused a great deal of



anger and frustration among the seniors of this province; and

"Whereas seniors do not prescribe their own medication and feel that the government should address the origin of the problem more carefully;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, are opposed to user fees for seniors' drugs and petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to accept the list of signatures on the attached document and request the government to work closely with seniors to develop an alternate plan."

Along with Karen Fariello, the people in Formosa have signed this, and they're represented by their president, Theresa Schnurr, and several others, including Sister Elsie Deemert and Sister Dorothy Middleholst, and I have added my signature in support of their request and the request of the seniors of the area to guard this sacred trust.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Haeck from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the committee's report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendments:

Bill Pr9, An Act to revive Kirbryn Holdings Inc

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the Village of Merrickville

Bill Pr42, An Act to revive Hellenic Orthodox Community of Kingston

Bill Pr54, An Act to revive Paragon Financial Corp

Bill Pr55, An Act to revive Philmanser Investments Ltd

Bill Pr80, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr Eddy from the standing committee on social development presented the committee's report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill, as amended:

Bill 4, An Act to amend certain Acts relating to Education.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Committee of the whole.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed; committee of the whole.

#### ROYAL ASSENT SANCTION ROYALE

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his office.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 6, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of Durham Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur la municipalité régionale de Durham

Bill 102, An Act to amend the Pay Equity Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'équité salariale

Bill Pr1, An Act to revive 506548 Ontario Limited

Bill Pr2, An Act to revive the Women's Counselling Referral Centre

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Ontario Association of Veterinary Technicians

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of London and Covent Garden Building Incorporated

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Korean Canadian Cultural Association

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Chua Di-Da (Amida-temple) of Toronto

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the City of London

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting The Kitchener and Waterloo Community Foundation

Bill Pr17, An Act to revive Aga Ming Property Owners Association

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Gloucester

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Town of Gravenhurst

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive John G. Todd Agencies Limited

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting Cambridge-Guelph Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Georgian-Simcoe Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting Picton-Trenton Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Stratford, Huron and Bruce Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting Waterloo-St Jacobs Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting Waubaushehene Railway Company Limited

Bill Pr34, An Act to revive Rosalind Blauer Centre for Child Care

Bill Pr36, An Act to revive Canindo Development Limited

Bill Pr37, An Act to revive P.O.I.N.T. Incorporated

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the Township of Atikokan

Bill Pr69, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa

Bill Pr74, An Act respecting the City of North York

Bill Pr77, An Act respecting the Town of Richmond Hill

Bill Pr84, An Act to revive Maranatha Christian Reformed Church of Woodbridge

Bill Pr85, An Act to revive The Optimist Club of Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Bill Pr87, An Act respecting the Township of Aldborough and the Village of Rodney

Bill Pr88, An Act respecting the Cruickshank Elderly Persons Centre.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT

#### LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Consideration of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**The First Deputy Chair (Mr Dennis Drainville):** I recognize the honourable Treasurer.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Thank you, Mr Chairman. I wonder if you'd allow me to invite a couple of members from the staff to sit in front of me, in view of the complexity of some aspects of this legislation.

**The First Deputy Chair:** That would be fine.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Mr Chairman, we believe the Finance minister needs all the help he can get, and we'd be pleased to assent.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If you'd allow me, Mr Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that members of the assembly recognize Graham Stoodley, who is director of legal services for the Ministry of Finance, and Craig Slater, who works in Management Board, who have been of enormous assistance in drafting the amendments and dealing with this legislation.

**The First Deputy Chair:** I thank the honourable Treasurer for those introductions.

We begin with section 1. Questions, comments or amendments? The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** We will not be proposing amendments specifically to this section of the act. In fact, we will not be proposing

amendments to any section of the act. Our position on this legislation, and I think it speaks to the purposes set out, is that this legislation itself is probably the worst piece of legislation we've seen, that it sets up an impossible process so that the purposes that are set out in these sections in fact cannot be achieved, and it also commits future governments to unmeasured financial liabilities.

We also believe that this legislation is likely to paralyse this government because of the legal challenges this government will face as a result of presenting and passing this legislation, should that be the outcome of this debate.

In our view, this is fundamentally flawed legislation and it is not susceptible to amendment, which is why we will not be proposing amendment.

1530

We understand that the third party intends to present some amendments, although there is some confusion as to just exactly how and when and what amendments it's going to be presenting. As we understand it, the amendments that the third party presents are not likely to be amendments at all, but are in fact the substance of a new bill, and we will ask, as this process continues, that you give your attention to the legitimacy of amendments.

The position that the third party has presented today reflects a whole different set of alternatives from those that the third party has up until yesterday claimed were the best alternatives on which to proceed. In fact, I believe the amendments the third party will present are simply a way of trying to put a better face on the fact that it has supported a very bad piece of legislation, a piece of legislation which will not achieve the purposes set out in section 1 of this act, which will not achieve restraint, which will in fact defer significant costs to a future government. The third-party amendments will simply add complexity to chaos.

It is for that reason that we are not proposing amendments to this section or to other sections. We do not see that the government amendments which have at this point been tabled are going to do anything at all to address the issue of whether this legislation can be made workable, and do not address the very real, long-term problems that this legislation creates. In our view, this legislation should be withdrawn, not amended, and if it will not be withdrawn by this government, it should simply be defeated.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Chair I think one of the things we often do as we begin bills is to have some idea if all of the amendments have been tabled by both the government and the third party. As you know, we will not be moving amendments. It is our information that there may be others that have not been made, but I wonder if we might not have a recitation now of the amendments which you have received. I



think that is customary, and if we could do that before we move into other parts of the debate on section 1, it would be of some help.

**The First Deputy Chair:** The suggestion has been made by the honourable member for Bruce that we have a recitation of the amendments that have been brought to the table to this point in time. That is a customary proceeding, as I understand, in the House. Are you rising to object to that, the honourable member for Markham?

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** Mr Chairman, the leader of the Liberal Party has made an opening comment—more like an opening salvo—

**Mrs McLeod:** And intended as such, thank you very much.

**Mr Cousens:** We love you dearly, except what you say. I just don't want to see you spend all the time—as long as I get a chance to speak here, because the problem we have is that the Liberals get up and make all kinds of pronouncements and statements and—

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** Just don't blow a gasket like you did in question period.

**Mr Cousens:** You never know what's going to happen, and that's what happens in the House. I'm willing to defer to that. I would like to comment as well, before I make my opening remarks, that all our amendments are not tabled. We have tabled a number of them and we have certain others that we may, depending on how this debate evolves and develops, bring in. I'm just not sure; therefore, I do not want to begin to say that all the amendments from our caucus are on the table.

**The First Deputy Chair:** We have had the request that we go through the amendments, and I would recognize the honourable Treasurer. Do you have amendments, sir, and could you please indicate which ones they are?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** We have tabled our amendments with the table. I don't know whether the official opposition wanted me to list the sections.

**Mr Elston:** Just a note of the sections.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** We are moving amendments to sections 5, 6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 39, 40, 41 and 47.

If I have the floor, I was going to make a couple of comments on section 1.

**The First Deputy Chair:** If we could just get all of them recorded, then we'll go on to the—I believe there are no amendments from the Liberal Party, so I would go to the third party. Do you have any amendments?

**Mr Cousens:** Indeed we do. It's rather peculiar that the government comes in with so many amendments. If they'd done some drafting in the earlier stage, we

wouldn't expect as much catch-up at this point. It shows the haste with which they're operating, the panic by which they're driven and the obvious lack of preparedness that they are—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** What section is this?

**Mr Cousens:** What section is this? Let me answer the question to the honourable Chairman, who isn't always so honourable.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Get it right, Don.

**Mr Cousens:** "Get it right," says Elinor. Go and enjoy Canada Day. It's a black Thursday for you and me.

**Interjection:** Alvin wants to know what he said.

**Mr Cousens:** Alvin wants to know—never mind. There is such a thing as a white Christmas, so I don't know what he has to say about that.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Cousens:** And you celebrate Christmas, too, so never mind.

Subsections 11(3) and (5) of the bill, subsection (4)—

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Twelve.

**Mr Cousens:** Chris, I'm doing this. Section 12, as Mr Stockwell just indicated, and I very much appreciate his help; subsection 23(2), section 24.

**Interjection:** One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight.

**Mr Cousens:** That's right: The whole of section 24 will be impacted by what we're talking about. Sections 25 to 32: We will have major changes to propose on that.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Couldn't you get it right the first time?

**Mr Cousens:** We had to respond to what you gave us and it's been pitifully hard. Subsections 33(3) and (4); subsection 36(1) of the bill; subsection 36(2). So let's just say section 36 has a considerable amount of change. Section 37: We have a number there. We will close off with the new section 49 of the bill. We're replacing what is there. Section 49 of the bill will be amended by adding a new section.

**The First Deputy Chair:** If I might question the honourable member for Markham, we have in our possession here at the table an amendment for section 39 and we also have—

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I was just getting my help here from the honourable member from Etobicoke—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** You were in trouble before that.

**Mr Cousens:** It's great, you know. We've got a team, which is something more than you've got. Section 39 and section 37 and section 41.

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: Although they have not yet been introduced, I've noted

that the Conservative amendments to subsections 11(3), (5), (4), (12) and subsection 23(2), along with the amendment proposed or tabled for subsections 33(3) and (4) are all, to the extent that they propose to strike out sections, it's my view, out of order. In fact, you require a vote against those sections and, as a result, those amendments are out of order and should be removed from the list.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order—

**The First Deputy Chair:** Hold on for a second. Let me just respond to that before we have any more points of order. I would say to the honourable member for Bruce that we've just received these at the table. I will make a ruling on those amendments as we come to them in the order of the proceedings. The member for Etobicoke West on a point of order.

**Mr Stockwell:** What you're saying is, as we proceed to those sections, you'll make your ruling, allowing us to—

**The First Deputy Chair:** Of course.

**Mr Stockwell:** Okay, thank you.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Before we continue, unless you're on a point of order, the honourable member for Markham?

**Mr Cousens:** No, I would like to take the floor, following the opening statement of the honourable leader of the Liberal Party.

**The First Deputy Chair:** We still have received these amendments and the honourable Treasurer wants to comment. Then, if you wish to comment on the amendments as well that you've put forward, that's the procedure we'll follow at this very instant. So I would say to the honourable Treasurer, if you have some comments relating to the amendments.

1540

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Very briefly, Mr Speaker, I took issue somewhat with the official opposition in that I do not regard the Conservative amendments as attempting to rewrite the bill; I think that they're legitimate amendments that simply try to cast the bill in a way that is more in keeping with what they believe it should be. I don't think that because they do that there's anything wrong with that. I think that it's well motivated and that we will deal with those.

I do regret the fact that the Liberal opposition has taken the easy way out and has decided that they're not capable of making decisions on a bill like this and they're simply going to vote against it, either because they think it's perfect the way it is and that therefore they're not going to move any amendments. I think the people in the province are getting a little weary of seeing the Liberal opposition not making any decisions at all, simply opposing everything that the government or anybody else does.

**The First Deputy Chair:** I think we'll take com-

ments from the honourable member for Markham first on the amendments that have been placed before the House.

**Mr Cousens:** I want to combine some remarks. I mean, the games keep changing.

The first thing I want to say is that I don't want to be here right now. I can think of so many other places I'd rather—

*Interjections.*

**Interjection:** Why don't we go to Bob's cottage?

**Mr Cousens:** It's true. I think it was Perrin Beatty who said, "If Bob Rae wants to be out at the end of a dock this weekend, there's nothing wrong with that, except that maybe he should be in Vancouver or Ottawa, where the Prime Minister's called him."

But to be here in the Legislature today dealing with this bill and the amendments that are before us, first of all, I want to make it very, very clear that the Conservative caucus is not thrilled with this bill or with the social contract.

The problem I have is that I keep on having the revisionist Liberals trying to interpret our actions and our stands and our positions without giving us time to at least explain what it is we want to do. I think it really has to be repeated here, and I'll repeat it again and again just so that there isn't any doubt as to our intention—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** You're going to vote against it on third reading.

**Mr Cousens:** Our intention—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** We knew that at first reading.

**Mr Cousens:** You don't have any control in this House, Mr Chairman, I can tell you.

**Mr Stockwell:** That's not for sure.

**Interjection:** You better check the numbers on second reading, David.

**Mr Cousens:** Even my own members are barking away. It's just terrible.

**Mr Elston:** I see some pretty determined faces behind you. They'll support you.

**Mr Cousens:** I've got the floor, and if it takes me a few minutes to explain what thoughts are up here, I'm going to do it.

The point that I want to make is that in our coming through second reading of this bill, our purpose in giving approval as a caucus to second reading was the intention of the government to try to reduce the public service costs, and a \$2-billion level was at least a meaningful level that began to make the Ontario fiscal and monetary policy somewhat viable.

We're into tough economic times. You'd never know it by the way the Liberals act, because the Liberals have consistently said, "We don't want anything," without



coming forward with any kind of responsible options. What we're trying to do is say that at least the government, in coming forward with its expenditure control plan and the social contract, has tried to find some ways of reducing the costs of government.

Now, that's a first. You're talking about a New Democratic government that, when it came to power, it was "Spend the way out of the recession." For some reason, and we haven't had a full explanation on how the honourable Minister of Finance came to this awakening, the government has now accepted the fact it can't continue as a government to spend as it did, so there's a stake in the ground where the government says: "From this point forward, we're going to try to reduce our spending. We're going to try to do something on the costs of just salaries through the whole public service of the province."

Our caucus in supporting those two initiatives did so in the blind faith, at that time, that there would be something that could come forward that we could work with that leads towards a good reconciliation of the competing needs of the province, not only the various unions that make it up but all the people who are part of this sectoral interest.

Our desire then is, if the government is going to do this, to find ways of doing it responsibly. Try to find ways so that as we make amendments you're not going to end up three years from now worse off than you are today. That is the problem with it, because it's going to be not unlike Pierre Elliott Trudeau with wage and price controls. He brought those in back in the 1970s, and as soon as the wage and price controls were lifted, it was a surge upwards. The cost of everything escalated quickly.

The amendments that are being brought forward by our caucus are ones that we hope will begin to deal with the three-year period we're in, not just create a need for more increases afterwards, deal with the situation honestly and hope that the government is able to work with us in opposition to find some ways of reconciling these very serious objections we have.

We have major objections with this bill, major objections, and in spite of those, the intention of the government to reduce the amount of money being spent in the public service by some \$2 billion is a meaningful step. We feel, as responsible members of the opposition, that it's one thing to just stand back and criticize, criticize, criticize and not come forward with any kind of constructive amendments that can take us forward into the next three years in a better way than we are now.

We are in a crisis. The Treasurer has said that, and we accept it. We believe there is a role that we can play in opposition to try to bring forward meaningful amendments that will change the bill, hopefully reduce the impact three years from now, hopefully find the \$2

billion, hopefully do it without causing large numbers of people to lose their jobs, hopefully ease the pain and suffering that this bill is coming in with in such a way that we can remove parts of that. You don't remove all of it. Not for a moment can one say that when you're into a \$2-billion saving of this nature you're going to make everybody happy. But at least be responsible.

Indeed, that's the kind of leadership our leader, Mr Harris of the Ontario PC Party, the member for Nipissing, has been voicing for the three years since he became leader of our party. In saying this now as a beginning comment, it therefore means that our amendments are important; they're important to us, and they're important to the large general public service out there.

We hope that the kind of thinking expressed in our amendments, which—I know that the Liberals have voted against everything. I mean, that's one thing they're consistent on. They have voted against everything this government has done, because they're still not over what it was like to have government at their fingertips when they were in power.

It's one thing to be opposition; it's another thing to be responsible in opposition. At least our own consciences are clear. I'm not going to talk about the consciences of the Liberals because who is to say how much conscience there is in their hearts, minds, souls or beings. That is not relevant.

As we lead into this, I would be pleased if we're able to deal rather honestly and fairly with each amendment and see some significant change come out of this bill and not just play with it. Let's try to move forward in such a way that we can do something with it.

We have our amendments, and I trust that we'll have opportunity. There has not been any agreement on time for discussion of this bill. Indeed, that could create a problem because we have no desire to filibuster this. If there's any fairness in it, then we can proceed section by section through the bill and seek to have this done.

The point is, and I said at the very beginning, I don't want to be here right now. I'd rather be elsewhere. The House should be recessed at this point. We were three weeks late coming in; we're now staying on into July. I just think it's important that we try to clean this up and have whatever is going to be done in place as soon as possible rather than just protract further discussions. Hopefully, through these discussions we can lead to some kind of improvement to what we have in this bill.

The bill is flawed; it requires change. The amendments that we have, hopefully, will direct the attention of all members of this House and the people that it serves in the kind of direction we want to take it.

1550

**The First Deputy Chair:** Just before we recognize some other members, we are looking now very specifi-

cally at sections 1 through 4. This being committee of the whole House, are there any specific comments having to do with sections 1 to 4? If there are, I recognize the honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I welcome the opportunity to begin the discussion on the bill. I happen to think, and I think people will come to recognize, that this is perhaps the most important bill we'll deal with over the life of the government. Perhaps you say that about a lot of bills, but I happen to think that this represents absolutely fundamental change. So I'm glad to be here to begin a detailed debate on the bill.

I think it's clear—and we can have our differences of opinion; I think the three parties' positions are clear—the government believes this is the right bill and is anxious to proceed with it. The Conservative Party, I personally think, sent out the wrong message when it voted in favour of the bill. I think the message that was received out there, in our opinion, was that the bill is directionally very right and can be fixed up with amendments. That was the message that I think the Conservative Party sent out. That's fine, if they want to do that.

Our party has quite a different perspective on it. I'm sure we'll get into a debate and you can say you don't agree with our perspective, and that's clearly the prerogative of all the members of the Legislature, but our belief is that the bill truly is fundamentally flawed. That's why I welcome the debate, Mr Chair. I believe that's the expression I should use when you're sitting in the chair of the committee of the whole. We'll refer to you as Chair. I believe the bill is fundamentally flawed and cannot be fixed because at the heart of it are some very fundamentally different approaches than we believe in and we will support. So I hope we do have a really good debate on it.

My leader just indicated we will not be proposing amendments because, as I say, we believe it is unamendable. Perhaps after several days of debate here, the public can make up their own minds, and then if the bill passes and the government has the numbers to do it, the public will see it in action.

I will say as well that I think on behalf of our party we will do nothing to be obstructionist on the bill. We feel, in some respect, an enormous sense of responsibility because the bill calls for 9,000 collective agreements to be reached, less than five weeks from now, and then nine of what the bill calls sectoral agreements have to be reached in five weeks. We're talking about peoples' lives here.

The option if they don't reach it in the bill is that the Minister of Finance in the end has the responsibility and the authority and the obligation to impose those agreements on 9,000 collective agreements, affecting almost

20% of our workforce in the province of Ontario. We welcome a thorough debate on it, but we will avoid accusations that we are being obstructionist on it. We will try to air fully our concerns.

Now we begin the debate and, if it's permissible, I'll actually start with the explanatory notes. I hope committee of the whole permits us to do that.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Actually, no, they're not considered part of the bill.

**Mr Phillips:** The purposes of the bill then, the preamble of the bill. Can the Minister of Finance confirm to us that the bill, if a collective agreement is not reached between the parties, will give him the authority for the next three years, until I think it's March 31, 1996, to finally impose collective agreements on the million people who are in the province of Ontario? If that's not the case, what is the resolution of a collective agreement that isn't reached through collective bargaining?

**The First Deputy Chair:** Would the honourable Treasurer like to respond?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm in your hands, Mr Chair, on the process. But, no, I have no intention of negotiating 9,000 agreements out there across the province. What this does on August 1—that's making the assumption that there are not voluntary agreements reached before then—if after August 1 agreements expire, they expire, and at the end of the three-year period, the process starts over again for the parties to negotiate agreements.

**Mr Phillips:** I hope we can perhaps get what I would regard as more forthcoming answers, because if an agreement isn't reached, how do you impose the settlement, Minister of Finance?

My understanding in reading the bill is that there is an appeal mechanism that ends up on your desk. So could you tell the House, if a collective agreement is not reached, how you are going to do what the Premier promised publicly, and that is that if the government was not happy with the results of the collective agreement, the government would step in.

I can recall the Premier saying that if people are laid off, and in the judgement in the government—and that's you, Minister—if in your judgement that is not an appropriate collective agreement, the government was going to step in. That was a promise made, I think, by the Premier.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think perhaps there needs to be some clarification. I don't think it's a deliberate misstatement by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, but I believe what the Premier was talking about was if a sectoral agreement—which is not a collective bargaining agreement but a sectoral agreement—prior to August 1 was arrived at that didn't meet the criteria which we have laid out, then that wouldn't be appropri-



ate. It would not be deemed to be an appropriate agreement. But there is no power in this legislation for the Minister of Finance to impose a collective bargaining agreement.

I would add that if after August 1 a collective agreement expires during the next three years between employees and their employer, there's nothing to stop those people from negotiating a new agreement as long as they don't negotiate an increase in compensation, because that is ruled out by the bill.

We need to make clear that when we're talking between now and August 1, we are talking about voluntary agreements at the sectoral and possibly the local level, we're not talking about collective bargaining agreements as we traditionally know them.

**Mr Phillips:** I think we're probably playing with semantics.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, no.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, you say no, but a sectoral agreement and a local agreement impose on the parties the same obligation as a collective agreement. If you want to use the term "sectoral agreement," fine, use sectoral agreement. I'll use collective agreement because it imposes on the two parties the same obligations. I'm just saying that the way I read the bill, you have the final authority, "The minister may designate."

**Hon Mr Laughren:** What section are you on?

**Mr Phillips:** I'm on part IV, and I thought the Chair said we could deal with part IV.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, it's okay. I just want to know which section you're on. I'm not challenging you.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, you're not answering my question and you're playing with semantics. If you say, "A sectoral agreement is different than a collective agreement," so a sectoral agreement is not a collective agreement, it's something you will choose to say is different, I say it is a collective agreement, and you have the authority, you alone have the authority, to finally determine whether this is an agreement or not.

I'm saying to you that from now on, for the next three years, you or your designate, you, the Minister of Finance, have the authority to make the final determination on whether or not 9,000 agreements involving a million people will or will not be an agreement. You finally sign those things. Is that correct?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** That is not correct. I have the authority, and the obligation, as the member puts it, between now and August 1 to approve sectoral agreements that affect, for example, the health sector or the municipal sector or the agencies, boards and commissions sector, to approve an agreement by which they will achieve certain savings over the next three years—

**Mr Elston:** Or you can reject them.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** —or reject them if they are

inappropriate. That's correct. But after August 1, that ends. After August 1, I have no authority to impose any agreement on anyone during the remaining length of the social contract period, which is a period of three years.

1600

**The First Deputy Chair:** Does the honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt have any more questions on that?

**Mr Phillips:** As I read the legislation, there are within the legislation opportunities for parties to essentially grieve the agreement, and in the final analysis, it is the Minister of Finance who makes the determination on that grievance. If I'm incorrect on that, I'd like to know that I am.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Persons have the right to grieve on matters associated traditionally with their collective agreement that do not have to do with the social contract. I believe I'm correct in that regard. But that surely is different than dealing with my imposing a collective bargaining agreement between parties. That's not what I do.

This legislation imposes, if you will—and I think the member for Bruce has got a point in the way he's making it in an out-of-order kind of way—this bill in a way imposes an agreement upon the parties based on compensation only, not on other matters that might be in place already through a collective bargaining agreement or in new matters that might be negotiated during the next three years that are not based on compensation. They could come to an agreement, if the collective bargaining agreement expires during that time, on matters other than compensation.

**Mr Phillips:** I'll let the other members, because I realize they want to participate, but as I look at what is included in the sectoral framework, there's very little in a significant way that wouldn't be included in a sectoral agreement. You've got everything from provisions relating to organization restructuring, productivity, alternative work arrangements, binding resolution of disputes.

Can you indicate the things that might be in a collective agreement that wouldn't be in a sectoral agreement? What sorts of things would you see in a collective agreement of a substantive nature? You're talking about compensation in the sectoral agreement and in the local agreements, all the compensation, all the hours of work, the unpaid leave, the pension contributions, I gather, the working conditions. What sorts of things might be in a collective agreement that you don't see in the sectoral and local agreements?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The obvious example, of course, would be wages, another might be seniority rights, but also I would point out that what the member for Scarborough-Agincourt was reading from was optional criteria within the sectoral agreement. Every

sectoral agreement doesn't have to have every one of these components in it for it to be designated as a legitimate sectoral agreement, but it does have to honour the basic framework of the social contract, which means that, for example, there's protection of low-income people in the social contract, there are compensation savings in it and there's a limit of 12 days' unpaid leave or days off without pay, a maximum of 12 per year.

**Mr Elston:** Temporary layoff.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** So those are the kinds of—"temporary layoff"—criteria that are in the sectoral agreements. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt read from a list of optional criteria, quite appropriately. Those don't have to be in every sectoral agreement, but they certainly could be, because they would perhaps make for a restructured and better-functioning public sector.

**The First Deputy Chair:** I recognize, continuing our discussion of sections 1 to 4, the honourable member for Mississauga South.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** Let me just say at the outset that it's really a little ironic to be addressing any section of this bill and hear the Liberal members say they welcome this debate. These are the members who wanted to defeat this bill at second reading, and now the member for Scarborough-Agincourt said, "We feel in some respects an enormous responsibility."

Well, that has got to be one of the most two-faced comments I've heard in this House. If they felt the enormous responsibility, they would have done what we did, which was to bring this bill to where we are today, in the committee of the whole House, where we can do something about the fact that the bill is poorly drafted, and where we do have an opportunity to bring amendments to the floor of this House and debate those amendments.

The fact is that the Liberals have voted against this bill because they didn't have any solutions. At the time we had the vote on second reading, they were in the position that we were, where they could either be constructive or just waste their vote.

It's incredibly amazing to hear the Liberal members talk about how this bill could have been defeated. The member for Bruce counts about as well as the member for Mississauga West, who put out a press release saying that this bill could have been defeated by all the opposition parties plus the members in the government who wish to vote against the bill. The fact is there was no way this bill could have been defeated by the two opposition parties, the independent members and those members who sit in the government who wish to vote against this bill.

It's just unfortunate. It probably explains why they

said they had an \$11-million surplus when they went out of office when in fact they had a deficit. It probably just goes to confirm that they still can't add in the Liberal Party. They can't add members in the House in terms of voting on a bill at any reading and they certainly couldn't add in terms of the treasury when they were in office as the government.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order, please. What section is the honourable member alluding to?

**Mrs Marland:** It's nice to know that the Liberal caucus is now welcoming this debate, to get back to the comments made.

**Mr Elston:** We've always welcomed the debate.

**Mrs Marland:** I wish the member for Bruce would decide not to interject and would speak when it's his turn to speak. I really object to the fact that he sits there and prattles away with his interjections. In fairness, I did not interrupt when the member for Scarborough-Agincourt was speaking, and I would ask the same respect and cooperation from the member for Bruce.

I think what we're dealing with here is the fact that this Bill 48 is a mess. It will not work in its present form. We have known that from the beginning, which is why we wanted to get it into committee of the whole, in order to place our amendments.

The good news today, although I have only just received the government amendments so I don't know what they say yet, is that obviously the government recognized that it was a poorly drafted bill. If it had been a perfect bill, then the government would not have needed to bring in its own amendments.

**Mr Elston:** Mr Chairman, on a point of order: We have yet to spend an hour in committee of the whole on Bill 48. I don't mean to interrupt the member from Mississauga—I apologize for this—but just now our office has received a notice of motion by the government to time-allocate the operation of Bill 48 in committee of the whole. We didn't send this bill out to committee. We are in committee of the whole, and already, with less than an hour, we have time allocation.

I ask the direction of the Chair, therefore, as to how it is we are to proceed to deal with the amendments in any fashion that gives us a chance to deal with the abrogation of collective agreements in this province, and how we're expected to carry out our duties as members if this hangs over our heads. Mr Chair, I ask your direction.

**The First Deputy Chair:** I would say to the honourable member for Bruce two things: The first thing is that this table has no consciousness that there is such a motion.

**Mr Elston:** You have just been told.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order, please. We have not received this at the table. Any arguments against such a motion being put to the House should be put at



the point when that motion is placed before the House. It has not been placed before the House at this point.

**Mr Stockwell:** Mr Chairman, on a point of order: Considering the fact of the information that was just given to this House by the member for Bruce, and I would believe it to be accurate, now that we have entered in all these amendments and both parties have stated, previous to this notice of motion being delivered to the Liberal caucus and I'm sure the Conservative caucus, that we were in no way going to filibuster this, that we are offering constructive solutions, it certainly leaves this caucus, our party, in a very difficult situation, having offered up significant amendments, and in less than an hour of committee of the whole, we're being put under the gun on time allocation.

I just want to put on the record our complete dismay at this government and its attitude to opposition and real opposition which we've tried to offer on this issue. It frustrates us to absolutely no end.

1610

**The First Deputy Chair:** I hear what the honourable member is saying. Again, I say to the honourable member that this has not come to the House, that it is not a motion that has been put to the House. We don't know when it will be put to the House at this point in time and it is not up to the chairperson to deal with this issue until it comes up through the proper channels.

The honourable member for Mississauga South has the floor, and I would ask to please focus on sections 1 to 4.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Chair, I'm happy to do that. I'm holding in my hand the government amendments, and there are 25 pages of them. I think that confirms, while speaking on sections 1 to 4, that the government itself recognizes that this is a poorly drafted bill, and it brings in 25 pages of its own amendments.

I'm simply saying to this government that we are dealing with Bill 48 and the havoc that it has wrought around this province, because of the people who live and work in Ontario and are in fear and jeopardy of their wellbeing because they see no way out with Bill 48, as it's presently drafted, that some of them can even survive financially in this province, and the problem for them is that their lives have been planned and based around security that they had in existing contracts.

The fact is that this government is willing to say to the public, "It doesn't matter what you've had, this is what it's going to be," and what we're saying as a party is that without our amendments, we have a tremendous concern about the direction that Bill 48, including sections 1 to 4, will take this province in. We see that sections 1 to 4 and a substantial number of the other sections of this bill are tremendously regressive.

The Treasurer said in answer a few minutes ago to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt that they're not

looking at other matters, that they're really concerned about the compensation. The fact is, that's what everybody's concerned about. Everybody's concerned about their compensation. Isn't this what it's about? It's about working, earning, and in turn, paying taxes in this province. It's about the working people surviving.

I'd like to ask the Treasurer, if there are no sectoral agreements, who then will adjudicate? What will the parameters be? What is your next step? Are you the adjudicator? Are you the person who then will decide? Could you answer that question, please?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm not quite sure which section we're addressing here, but generally speaking, if there are no sectoral agreements reached by any of the sectors out there or any particular sector doesn't reach an agreement, then of course what happens is that this bill, as of August 1, is what kicks into place, and then that is the compensation and other matters that will be the order of the day. So there's no requirement that there be sectoral agreements before August 1.

If there are sectoral agreements, however, it is to the benefit of employees in those various sectors, because there will be lower savings targets in each of those sectors, in each municipality, for example, so there is an incentive for people to sign sectoral agreements. They may decide not to. They may decide that they don't like the principle that's involved in this bill and that therefore they're not going to agree to any sectoral agreements. That's fine, but not only will they not have access to a lower target but they would not have access to the job security fund, which is \$100 million a year for three years, and now that must be accomplished by August 1.

So there's a real incentive to accomplish a sectoral agreement. It's not simply that they only have four or five weeks to do it. There were negotiations going on for the last couple of months to try and get agreements. Also, if there's no sectoral agreement, there can still be agreements reached at the local level between employees and their employer. There's no requirement, but it is to the advantage of everyone, I believe, that there be voluntary sectoral agreements reached.

But as a government, we cannot assume that this will happen, because if we did and then it didn't happen, where would we achieve the \$2 billion in savings in public sector compensation? That's why we need this bill, which is a form of fail-safe, to make sure we achieve the savings we've made a commitment to achieve, in this fiscal year and in the next two fiscal years.

**Mrs Marland:** I say to the Minister of Finance, when you talk about the job security fund, what people in this province are interested in is working. They're not looking for a job security fund; they're looking for a job. They already have jobs that they want to keep; that's what this issue is about. They're not interested in

a job security fund because they've been laid off from the jobs they have today. They're interested in continuing to work in their place of employment today.

When you talk about sectoral agreements, are you looking at the fact that in different sizes of municipalities, that kind of framework is very difficult to develop? How do you address the size of the sector when you start breaking it up into small municipalities?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** To respond, in section 3 of the bill the public sector has been divided into various sectors. There is the Ontario public service sector, there is the health sector, there is the community services sector, the schools sector, the colleges sector, the universities sector, the agencies, boards and commissions sector and the municipalities sector. A municipality, whether a small one or a large one, an urban one or a rural one, a local municipality or a regional municipality, would fit into the municipality sector and within that sector would be given a specific target on savings.

I don't think the member for Mississauga South is disagreeing with the need to achieve savings in public sector compensation, but her comments have led me to believe that perhaps she's having second thoughts in that regard. I don't want to read anything into her mind that might not be there already, but I really am starting to wonder about the Conservative opposition, as to whether or not it is still on side on the need to achieve savings in public sector compensation.

**Mrs Marland:** Because of the shortage of time, I don't really think the Treasurer and I should waste time exchanging conjecture. I don't want you to read anything into what I'm saying, Treasurer, other than that I am extremely concerned about where Ontario is today, with a Premier who won't even represent us nationally. I'm even more concerned about the fact that we have Bill 48 before us, which is one big mess, and now we know we're going to be curtailed with a time allocation motion to control the amount of time we can spend to even provide a remedy for this badly drafted bill.

What I'm asking you about that municipality or that school board is this: Are their savings going to be measured against school boards and police forces and public works departments in municipalities across this province, or are you going to recognize the city of Mississauga and its particular needs and its particular demands against the town of Bracebridge, which is 10,000 people, versus almost 500,000 people in the city of Mississauga?

1620

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I wouldn't compare any municipality to Mississauga, to start with. I just wanted to reassure the member for Mississauga South that the targets for savings that were allocated to each municipality were based on their compensation; that's what it was based on. Then we also are taking into consideration the number of employees in each municipality

who earn below \$30,000, because there was a danger of a distortion. In my own constituency, there is perhaps nobody earning over \$30,000 because of part-time people and so forth who do the job. That has been taken into consideration. I want to assure the member for Mississauga South that the targets have been established in as fair a way as possible in keeping with the compensation of the various municipalities.

**Mrs Marland:** Minister of Finance, that is the concern of a municipality like Mississauga, that you did take into the equation the people who earn under \$30,000, yet when it comes to the bill you're exempting them. I heard the member for Grey say earlier this week that nobody in his municipality earns over \$30,000, yet they have to be part of the contributors.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'll attempt to clear it up. First of all, the reductions in expenditures for each of the municipalities are not in the bill itself. That is being done outside the bill.

Secondly, in that process each municipality has been given a target and that target is taking into consideration the number of people who earn under \$30,000 a year, because it would not be fair, for example, if a small municipality had one person, ie, the clerk, who was earning over \$30,000 and everybody else was part-time and earned under \$30,000, to achieve the savings entirely out of the hide of the one person who was earning over \$30,000. The targets have been reduced according to the percentage of that municipality's payroll that is under \$30,000.

For that reason, there's an attempt, first of all, to recognize that in the municipalities across the province. Secondly, the bill itself does exempt people earning under \$30,000 a year from the provisions of the Social Contract Act; there was an awareness that people earning under \$30,000 are not those who can afford to give up compensation.

**The First Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Mississauga North wanted to continue.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I'd like to address the point raised by the member for Mississauga South and the Minister of Finance. I'd like to ask the Minister of Finance this specific question:

You will know, Minister, that the targets for municipalities under the social contract were assessed by virtue of municipalities filing financial information records. Your government used the financial information records of a municipality such as Mississauga for the year 1991; you used the total compensation paid by the city of Mississauga in 1991 as your benchmark for the social contract target. In other words, what you did was that all municipalities must file financial information records, and in those records there is a category called "total compensation paid," and that includes total compensation paid, all the money. It includes all



benefits; it includes all people, no matter what they have made, over and under \$30,000; it includes overtime; it includes part-time workers. There is one total sum that is reached.

Your government took that total amount and took 5% of that and said that is the target that municipalities such as Mississauga must meet. But what you have also done is that you have exempted people under \$30,000, so you have said to municipalities such as the city of Mississauga that the target they must reach must include dollars that you have exempted.

I see the Minister of Finance shaking his head, but I will tell you, I have been informed by the manager of the city that they have a letter, and they were trying to get in touch with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to explain the problem they have encountered.

In dollar terms, what that means is that the 5% or the target for the city of Mississauga is, let us say, about \$6.5 million, but if you had excluded from their target the dollars that you have excluded of people making under \$30,000, their target would only have been something like \$4.8 million. So Mississauga has a shortfall of close to \$2 million by virtue of, I respectfully say, faulty mathematics on your government's part. They have no opportunity of reaching the target because you have included dollars they have to meet which your legislation exempts.

Minister, I would like you to verify whether the 5% or the social contract target that municipalities have to reach includes all compensation paid as filed by municipalities for their financial information records of 1991. Before you respond to this, let me inform you that I have been informed by the city that indeed it does include all compensation paid, and you have not made any change or measurement for those who are exempt under the legislation.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think the member is referring, by "the people who are exempt," to the under \$30,000. Yes? Okay.

First of all, there was an assumption in the original targets that, I believe the number was, about 14%, of employees earn under \$30,000 in the municipalities. I believe that was incorrect and that in some municipalities it's significantly more than that. That is being adjusted to make sure that municipalities are not penalized, if I could use that word without you holding me to it later; that municipalities will not have to achieve targets that include compensation for people earning under \$30,000. That is being done because I do recognize the point the member makes, and I believe we've corrected it now.

**Mr Offer:** It is not just those who are under \$30,000. You have also put into the equation people in 1991 who worked overtime, who were part-time, who were casual. You factored benefits into that figure,

which a municipality cannot adjust for because those are benefits. I'm wondering if the minister is saying that not only are they going to adjust for the \$30,000 and under but also for all of those benefits that you have shackled the municipality with that cannot be met by the municipality in its social contract targets.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, I will not make that commitment. There are limits to how complex we want to make this whole exercise, and I think that what the member is suggesting would indeed make it much more complex. Secondly, there is the necessity of achieving the fiscal savings that we laid out at the beginning.

1630

**The First Deputy Chair:** Further questions? In rotation, we will go to the honourable member for Etobicoke West. We're still on sections 1 to 4.

**Mr Stockwell:** Yes, section 4, with respect to the \$30,000 employee exemption. I have a list of municipalities as long as your arm, but a few of them, Sydenham, St Vincent, Sullivan, Holland and so on and so forth have received—

**Mr Elston:** They all sound like Grey.

**Mr Stockwell:** There are a number in Grey, but not just Grey, around this province, who have outlined their reductions by your Municipal Affairs minister, and the perfect example I can give you is the \$16,000 Sydenham reduction, but they only have two employees who earn over \$30,000 a year.

I understand you'll take it into consideration when you reduce their amounts, but explain to me exactly what you expect small municipalities such as these to do.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I expect, with the revised reductions they will get, that will remove the major irritant that's there now—not just an irritant, it's a major problem, I would concede. So I think that's not going to be a problem when we remove the under-\$30,000 component from municipalities that, for example, have only two or three employees earning over \$30,000 and a whole raft of employees or a lot more employees, three or four or five or six, earning less than \$30,000. So I really do believe we've come up with a formula that will resolve that problem.

**Mr Stockwell:** This formula is where? That's the first question. No one I know of has seen this formula other than maybe you. I think the local municipalities would like to be the judges of whether or not this formula would work. Surely, before we vote on this bill, we will be given the opportunity of seeing this magical formula that's going to resolve these issues.

The next question I have is with respect to sectoral framework agreements. If there is not an agreement in a sectoral framework, you're suggesting that you would then not impose a collective agreement. The question is, what would happen if there is no sectoral agreement,

they don't take advantage of the carrots that you offer? Who then would sit and preside over any kind of negotiated settlement?

**The First Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Nickel Belt has a response?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm not sure I understood the question, but if he's saying that in a particular sector, such as the municipal sector, which you've been talking about, if there's no sectoral agreement reached and there are no local agreements reached in the various municipalities, then what happens is that the provisions in this bill take effect as of August 1.

**Mr Stockwell:** Who then interprets whether or not the provisions of this bill are applied to specific sectors? Is that a decision that you make? Is that a decision that your cabinet makes? I mean, who makes the exact decision as to how this bill is implemented within each sector?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** At that point, whatever is in this bill applies to municipalities, with the additional requirement that each municipality has a specific reduction target it must achieve each year for the next three years. So that's what will determine the savings in that particular municipality, every municipality in the province and everybody else who has an employer-employee relationship in the public sector in the province. So after August 1, this is what determines the compensation paid in the entire public sector.

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand that, Mr Finance Minister, but somebody someplace will have to interpret what exactly will be the agreement: how many dollars will be taken here, how many dollars will be taken there. There's a whole bunch of open-ended questions left in here. The question I have for you is, who then sits down with those parties and determines exactly who gets what nailed, what comes off and where are the reductions to take place?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm sorry, I did misunderstand the question in the first instance. At that point, it's the responsibility of the employer—the municipality, to use this example—to determine how it's going to make itself function, given the requirements of this act for savings. That's why there's some safety put in the legislation regarding the protection of low-income persons, for example, concerning the maximum number of days off without pay, concerning all employees having to be treated fairly so that the only people who pay the price of days off, for example, without pay would be people in the front lines as opposed to people in management.

So that's what will take place, but somebody has to administer that. I think that's what the member's asking and I think it's a fair question. That would, of course, be the employer, whether it's in a hospital or a municipality or whatever.

**Mr Stockwell:** Briefly, then, we have now, let's say, the municipalities. The municipalities implement a plan. Who, then, signs off on that plan, saying that plan is acceptable, and in essence becomes the arbitrator of a long-term three-year collective agreement? Who puts their initials to that, that says, "I am now the boss of both worker and employer; I sign off an agreement and impose a three-year collective agreement"? Who is that person?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** First of all, after August 1, if an employer comes up with a plan to accomplish the required savings for that—I'll use the example of a municipality again—that plan must be posted. That plan is open to an appeal by the employees, for example, to an adjudicator who would sign off on it and say, "Yes, that's an appropriate appeal," or, "It's an inappropriate appeal." There are time limits in the bill that lay out how long that can take, so it doesn't take for ever. So that's who in the end would determine that it was an appropriate plan of action to accomplish the savings required.

**Mr Stockwell:** But again, through that, there's an adjudicator who then signs off on the plan, but there's an appeal process involved.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** To the adjudicator.

**Mr Stockwell:** Right. As I understand the appeal process, the adjudicators operate under you. They report to you, the Finance minister. They are your warriors out there negotiating these deals. In essence, would it be fair to say that if there's no deal, the final sign-off for any collective agreement bound for three years between employer and employees ultimately becomes the responsibility of the adjudicator, but in realistic terms, according to this legislation, you, the Finance minister?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The adjudicator would be appointed by Lieutenant Governor in Council. If you think I'm going to involve myself in every—

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** But you've got to.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, I'm not going to. The appeal process—

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Let me finish. The appeal process begins and ends with the adjudicator and the adjudicator will have the appropriate criteria for plans of achieving the savings. So you can say that the ultimate responsibility is the Minister of Finance if you like, but in fact, once the adjudicator has signed off on it, either with an appeal process or without an appeal process, that then would become the operative plan for that municipality or hospital or whatever.

**Mr Stockwell:** Lastly, I just want to make sure everyone's understanding this part of the legislation. I don't know anybody who would suggest to me that you can appoint an adjudicator and that adjudicator becomes the be-all and end-all for all decisions at a political level.



Let's be frank here. The adjudicator is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor and he is appointed by whom? The government. Who in the government appoints the adjudicator? The Finance minister is going to appoint these adjudicators. You can tell me all you want about an adjudicator, but you've appointed this adjudicator. You've written the rules about what the deal must be. So then you yourself become the all-powerful one who can implement a three-year collective agreement on both employee and employer.

Just to get down to the short strokes of this thing, you are the decision-maker. You appoint the adjudicator to carry out your wishes, your bidding. In essence, when they sign that off, they're only signing it off according to your terms, your conditions, your collective agreements.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If the member wants to say that the buck stops here, that's fine. I don't mind acknowledging that. However, I would simply reinforce what I said before, that the adjudicator must adhere to what's in this legislation and not to some whim of mine. The adjudicator must follow the rules as laid down by—

**Mr Elston:** This is your whim.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** We do live in a parliamentary democracy where legislation does have to be brought forward by ministers of the crown. If you've got a better system than that, I'd like to know what it is.

I would say to the member for Etobicoke West that these are the rules under which the adjudicator will have to perform, and I don't think the fact that he or she is appointed by an order in council means that I'm going to be meddling in every plan out there to accomplish savings at the local level.

1640

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I want to address some concerns with regard to the job security fund and get some clarification. I understand section 1, particularly paragraph 4 of that section, but I must just share with you a brief quote here. It says:

"I will be supporting this legislation because this is probably, of the pieces of legislation this government has introduced, as close to the Conservative philosophy as anything they will ever have introduced."

That was my good friend the member for Etobicoke West, Mr Stockwell. We understand, sir, why you supported it. We're not quite sure why others did. Let it be clear that had all members of the opposition, along with the members of the government who voted against this, stood unanimously against this bill, we would have been within two votes of defeating the bill and the government. We all know there were six members of the government who didn't bother to come in and vote and two others could have just as easily got locked in the washroom. We really did have a chance.

In any event, my concerns, to the Treasurer, surround some advice given out in relationship to the first

section—I guess we'll call it the purpose clause of the act—advice given out by members of your staff to people in the municipal sector. I asked a question on this in the House but didn't get an answer. Maybe you can help me with it.

They're saying that 12 days will not meet the target you've set, whether it be my own municipality or many, many other municipalities. In fact your officials have clearly indicated that they recognize this is a problem throughout the municipal sector. Just giving everybody 12 days off, when you factor in all of the different problems, whether it be the exemptions for folks under \$30,000 not being included or whether it be the critical people who are not included—whatever it is—they're coming up, in the case of my municipality, \$1.8 million short. But in many, many municipalities they're coming up hundreds of thousands and, indeed, millions of dollars short.

Your ministry people have said their options are to negotiate more days than 12 as days that would be taken without pay as option 1, even though that's not allowed under the bill. They could look at layoffs and that would be, it seems to me, contradictory to paragraph 2 of this section, where you state that the purpose is to "maximize the preservation of public sector jobs."

The third option is service cuts and these are coming right out of your ministry, sir, that were given to these people.

**Mr Elston:** It was out of Municipal Affairs.

**Mr Mahoney:** I'm sorry. That's right, it was out of the financial division of Municipal Affairs, my House leader points out. The other thing is that it's to preserve services. So you want to preserve jobs, preserve services. It doesn't allow for more days off. The fourth option was that the municipalities could, in effect, institute a tax increase to the property taxpayer. I don't know how that advice fits in with the purpose clause in this particular bill. Maybe you could help me out.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I shall attempt to provide an answer. If you'll allow me to wax philosophical just for one moment without delaying the debate, because I know members want to get this legislation through, the debate around expenditure reductions and on the social contract, I think, has made it clear to a lot of the people in the province that, while they support expenditure reductions by government—everybody wants the government to spend less money, for obvious reasons—what's becoming very clear, as we go through a process of achieving \$4 billion in expenditure reductions and \$2 billion in public sector compensation through the Social Contract Act, is that there's going to be pain felt out there all across the province. The day is gone when we should think that we can achieve this size of expenditure reductions in government without its being felt all across the province in the delivery of services and in the provision of jobs.

I think that people are realizing it now, that while they want government expenditures to be reduced, and I do too, there is a price to be paid for that, and that is inevitably going to be in some cases fewer services being delivered, being delivered in a better way perhaps, in a more efficient way. But also there could very well be in some cases some layoffs, because anybody who thinks that we can achieve expenditure reductions of this magnitude, along with the expenditure reduction package of \$4 billion, without having an impact out there is going to be disabused of those ideas in the next couple of years.

I think that while people don't like to see a reduction in services at the community level, they do appreciate and will increasingly appreciate the fact that if we're going to achieve the reduction in expenditures by government, this is the way it's going to be felt all across the province.

**Mr Mahoney:** I appreciate that answer and the philosophical aspects that led into what I think was a direct admission that there will be layoffs from this. I haven't heard that admission by the Treasurer or by the Premier or by the government.

It's quite clear then that your statements, to the Treasurer—follow me on this—I don't know how you can call it a job security fund, Treasurer, when really what it is, as I understand it, is a fund that will top up unemployment insurance for one year to allow those people who are laid off to have a little more money than they might otherwise have as a result of losing their job. So it's not a job security fund.

But seriously, if it were a fund that was used to pay for the job or to subsidize the municipality in some way to keep that worker on, then you could say it is a fund used to secure that job. That's not what it is. It is a fund used to help individuals who have just lost their job, to help them survive some kind of transition period, up to 12 months, when they're out of work, clearly.

It may seem like a small point, but to me it's fundamental to the whole legislation and to our claim that the legislation is fundamentally flawed, because it says you're claiming to be providing a job security fund when you're not doing that. You in fact are admitting that—they can't negotiate more days off. I saw you nod in agreement when I said that that's not in the legislation. So that's not on. That advice from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs staff to the municipal sector is not on. That's wrong advice. They can't do that. So they can lay off, they can cut services or they can increase taxes.

Nobody's disputing the fact that there has to be pain. We have argued from day one, however, that you should listen to organizations like the provincial conservation authorities, who have offered you \$100 million on the platter, who have admitted that they're part of the problem, who say that they can resolve the problem through adjustments internally within the conservation

authorities around the province. Would you only listen to them?

The municipalities have said—there was a proposal that was never formalized, and it would have to go through the negotiation process, but I understand, to the Treasurer, there was a proposal to effect a 5% cutback in the municipal sector in wages for six months with a 1% increment increase every six months. So you'd go to 95% of your wages today and in six months you'd go to 96%, six months after that to 97%, up until you got back to 100% of the wage level. The municipalities, some of them that looked into this as an option, were saying, "Give us this option, give us a tool by which we can effect that and negotiate that." You're not doing that, Treasurer.

Clearly, the point is strongly made that, when you get to the purpose clause—and I've seen you and your officials nodding in agreement with my statement, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, but nodding in agreement with the principle that it's not a job security fund—it just shows that the whole principle, the purpose of the legislation, is flawed and not something that we're able to support, unlike members of the third party, who think that they can—

1650

**Mr Stockwell:** Is there a question here?

**Mr Mahoney:** I've already asked it—members of the third party, who think that they can vote in favour of this because—what was it?—it is as close to the Conservative philosophy as anything they've ever intended, and then stand up and say that it's flawed and it's wrong and in a short few days—I guess they read it. I guess they hadn't read it before they voted on second reading. They've since read it, found out that they agree with us, and I understand they're going to be in fact voting against it on third reading.

**Interjection:** No, I can't believe it.

**Mr Mahoney:** I heard a rumour to that effect. But I wonder if you might have a response to the job security issue and whether or not that section of section 1 should be changed dramatically.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** First of all, I would assure you that not even I could vote for this bill if I thought it adhered to the principles of conservatism.

**Mr Stockwell:** It does.

**Mr Mahoney:** It does.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, it's responsible fiscal administration of the province of Ontario, for which there was no evidence during the Davis or the Robarts years. So I don't think it has got anything to do with progressive conservatism. I won't get into the Liberal years.

The member makes a good point on the job security fund. I would add one caution on his comments, though. One potential use of the money is the ability to extend



employment through use of this fund, which otherwise would not be possible, so that there would be an opportunity for an employer to access this fund to extend employment which would otherwise end. To that extent, there's a potential for job security that would not otherwise be there. But basically I don't quarrel with much of what the member said, but that part of it, it seems to me, does give it legitimacy to be called a job security fund.

**Mr Mahoney:** Just very briefly on that point, if the fund can be used to extend employment for a certain period of time or to keep a permanent job in place, does that not then deplete the fund and make less money available to help those people who are being laid off? You're going to be spending money to keep full-time jobs going. Is it a job security fund or is it—but quite seriously, what is it? If you're creating a job security fund with X millions of dollars in it and you're creating a top-up fund for unemployment benefits, call it what it is and change it and tell us that there are two separate funds here.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It does both; that's why it's called what it is. If someone has his employment extended, then he doesn't have to draw on it as a top-up to unemployment insurance, for example. So the member is trying to make a bit of a wonky argument, it seems to me, in dealing with this fund.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** He's not trying; he did a pretty good job of it.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** He did a good job of making a wonky argument. But it seems to me that the purpose of the fund is twofold. It is the way the member described it, but it's also to extend employment which otherwise would end, and this fund can be accessed for that. Of course, I would want to put in a caution here that the job security fund is available to those who are part of a sectoral agreement. That's the purpose of the job security fund.

**Mr Phillips:** It's a hammer.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I wouldn't call it a hammer; I'd call it an incentive to achieve voluntary agreements at the sectoral level. I think that's what we're all after, including members of the opposition, I would think, particularly those who have a problem with the legislation. In order to avoid the necessity of the legislation, of course, we've provided an incentive for people to achieve voluntary agreements through sectoral agreements and through local agreements.

**Mr Mahoney:** It clearly would be an incentive if it were offered in a spirit of cooperation and negotiation. But when you put a date and a hammer on the end of it, it's no longer an incentive; it's clearly, "Do this or else."

The argument is, with all due respect, not wonky at all. The argument is that you have simply said you are

providing a job security fund, which in fact is an unemployment fund—that's all it is—and if they come to the table and come into your central agreement and buy into what you're trying to force them to do, then you'll take some of that money and put it into some yet-to-be-defined process that might protect a few jobs? I don't know. You're creating—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** To do what?

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, Treasurer, you're creating a system—you've admitted it—where you're going to create layoffs all over the province in every sector. You've admitted that today for the first time. I heard the Treasurer admit it. That would be in Hansard. You admitted that there would be layoffs.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** That isn't what he said at all.

**Mr Mahoney:** If that isn't what you said, Treasurer, stand up and say it again. There are going to be layoffs throughout every sector that is involved in these negotiations. It's one of the options, and I was referring to the municipal sector. Your officials have admitted it and you have too.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I must say that people wonder why politicians are not more forthcoming and frank when they have discussions either here or elsewhere. I want to tell you one of the reasons that makes me cautious is when somebody takes what I've said and distorts it. I never said this legislation was going to cause layoffs all across the province in every sector, either through sectoral agreements or any other cause.

If the member opposite wants to take my words and twist them and distort them, then I'll leave that up to him and let him sit in judgement of himself. But I want to tell you that I've tried to be very direct and frank and say that in some cases there may—there may be—be layoffs at the municipal level or whatever. I did not say that this would mean there would be layoffs all across the province in every sector.

I would simply ask the members that if they want me to be direct in my responses and as frank as possible, please don't twist that response when I give it.

**Mr Mahoney:** I'll accept the Treasurer's—I really was not trying to twist your words.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Mahoney:** No, I was not.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** It comes naturally.

**Mr Mahoney:** Yes, it probably does when I deal with you.

The fact is, Treasurer, that you have admitted, in response to the question I asked—you want to use the term "may well be layoffs." You can sit in judgement of yourself, sir. The reality is that your officials are telling people in the municipal sector that one of the options they have to meet the targets is layoffs. Now, you can put semantics around that any way you want

and you can throw a tantrum if you want to throw a tantrum; there will be layoffs as a result of this bill and it is not a job security fund.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'll respond differently in the future to the member opposite and be less direct and forthcoming.

**Mr Cousens:** The Liberals, and I can see that they've got points, but we have amendments and the government has amendments and I'm wondering whether we could proceed. There's an awful lot to be done and the time is limited. I'd be quite prepared—

**Mrs Marland:** If the Liberals have so much to say, why don't they put them into—

**Mr Cousens:** The point is extremely valid, "If the Liberals had so much to say, let's put some amendments around it," but that's part of the process.

**Mr Phillips:** What would you amend this piece of crap for?

**Mr Cousens:** Well, you know, if you want to talk like that, as the Liberals, I don't think that's parliamentary language for the honourable member. If you want to start talking like that, that's not the way we are.

I suggest, Mr Chairman, if there's any way we can approve 1 to 4, and then move to number 5 and proceed with some amendments.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Is there any more discussion on sections 1 to 4? The honourable member for Mississauga North.

**Mr Offer:** I have a question and it has to do with—I'm pulling out the legislation. As we're dealing with sections 1 to 4, section 2, the definition of "public sector," which "means the public sector as described in the schedule." My question to the Minister of Finance is, has there been any change to the definition of "public sector" by amendment to this legislation?

**The First Deputy Chair:** I wonder if the member for Mississauga North could pose the question again so the honourable Minister of Finance could hear it. I believe he was indisposed.

**Mr Offer:** My question to the Minister of Finance is: Section 2 contains definitions. One deals with the phrase "public sector" and it's defined as "in the schedule." I'm wondering if there has been any change by the government in terms of the description of the definition of "public sector."

1700

**Mr Phillips:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: The Minister of Finance legitimately has to leave here at 5:45, so from our party's perspective, we have no difficulty if the parliamentary assistant should stand by and answer the question. I believe the minister has something to do right now, will be back and then has to leave. From our perspective, and I suspect from the third party's, we're quite happy to have the parliamen-

tary assistant respond to these questions.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I appreciate that very much and ask you to be as gentle on him as you have been on me.

But if I could give a one-word answer, no.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Excuse me. Before we continue on, do we have consent of the House that the honourable parliamentary assistant take the seat of the minister? We do? Fine. Carry on.

**Mr Offer:** To the parliamentary assistant, you will know that the Minister of Finance has indicated that there has been no change in the definition of "public sector" in the social contract legislation. I have a problem as a result of that, and I'm hoping this can be clarified.

On June 23, I asked a question of the Premier, and the question to the Premier dealt with the definition of "public sector." My question dealt with the issue that municipalities privately contract for—let me give you two examples: the pickup of garbage, and for school buses.

Under the schedule which defines "public sector," it says that those groups, private sector contracts, would be caught up in the net of Bill 48, the social contract legislation. Clearly that is the way the legislation reads.

My problem now deals with the Premier and/or the Minister of Finance, because the Premier's response to my question, when I brought forward the implications of that definition, was, and I read from Hansard; these are the Premier's words: "...discussing it informally with ministers here, that's not our view of the intent of the act." The Premier is indicating that that is not going to be the intent of the act, even though that is the wording, and says that amendments would be brought forward to exclude that definition.

So my question is—help me out on this—what did the Premier mean when he said these words, or what did the Minister of Finance mean when he said there were not going to be any changes to the definition?

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** As soon as the legislation is passed, the schedule can be amended by regulation.

**Mr Offer:** Well, this causes a great deal of difficulty, because we have the legislation now, we have the appendix now, we have the schedule now, and the schedule says for municipal affairs that a public sector includes, and I am paraphrasing, a corporation which provides (a) for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage and other refuse for a municipality; or (b) the operation and maintenance of buses for the conveyance of passengers under—these are school kids we're talking about. The Premier has said in this Legislature, in Hansard, that this is not the intent of the legislation.

We have now heard the Minister of Finance say that there have been no changes, or, in other words, it is the intent of the legislation. We have an obligation to the



people who collect refuse for municipalities, to the people who drive school buses across this province. Are they or are they not part of the bill? The Premier says they are not going to be. The Minister of Finance says they are going to be. Amendments or whatever down the line are not what people are calling for. We want to know: What is your position on this crucial issue?

**Mr Sutherland:** Again I would say that the issue could be dealt with through regulations.

**The First Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Mississauga—

**Mr Offer:** No, no.

**The First Deputy Chair:** No? We need to move in rotation, then. The honourable member for—

**Mr Offer:** I would like to defer to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

**The First Deputy Chair:** We have been going in rotation.

**Mr Phillips:** We can come back to this, Mr Chair, because I think we'd like to discuss it more.

**The First Deputy Chair:** If you're sure you don't want to handle this. The honourable member for Mississauga South.

**Mrs Marland:** It's just fascinating, sitting here, that the Liberals have so many questions about this bill when they didn't have a single amendment to bring forward to it.

**Mr Offer:** It's not amendable. It's a rotten piece of legislation.

**Mrs Marland:** It's a dynamic participation that you are making in this bill. You must be so happy that we have committee of the whole so that you're now having an opportunity to speak to a bill which you wished to defeat outright.

**Mr Offer:** Absolutely.

**Mrs Marland:** All right. If it's not worth amending, then why bother taking up the time when we have constructive amendments here that we want to get through? We want to amend this bill so that it ends up being something that's equitable and workable for the people of this province.

At this point in time, we do not believe that either of those aspects are contained in this bill, but we do want to get on with the work of amending the bill so that if and when this government passes it, it will contain those areas about which we represent the concerns of the people of this province, which those people who wanted to defeat it outright were not willing to do. Knowing full well that this government has the numbers and has the power to pass the bill without any amendments, we're simply saying that if they're going to pass it, let's amend it to contain those factors that are of most concern to us.

In sections 1 to 4, I wish to ask the parliamentary

assistant to the Minister of Finance, who has had to leave—we have this wonderful thing called the “public sector job security fund.” When you read it, it sounds quite encouraging to those poor people who are going to have to be laid off when the Bob Rae socialists pass this bill.

**Interjection:** With your help.

**Mrs Marland:** The Liberals are so paranoid; they say “with our help.” I really think it's so regrettable that the Liberals do not yet know that the NDP government has the power to pass this bill tonight, on its own, without any single vote from this side of the House. I don't know why the Liberals do not understand that, but I'm not going to harp on it any more. It's the biggest mistake they've made, and they're trying to justify the position they took, which was ludicrous. And now, of course, they're trying to use up the time so we can't even get on with the amendments.

Under the public sector job security fund, it says in subsection 8(2), “The purpose of the fund is to provide, in accordance with this act and the regulations,

“(a) payments to employees who are released from employment by their employers; and

“(b) payments to employers for the purpose of extending the employment of employees who will be released from employment by the employers.”

In other words, on the surface the job security fund sounds like it's going to solve everything: It's going to look after the employees who have to lose their jobs or it's going to help the employers keep the employees working. If it weren't so serious, it could almost be humorous, it's so incredibly written. In any case, this is what the public sector job security fund is.

Now, bear in mind, of course, that there's no private sector job security fund in this province; we're talking now about creating a public sector job security fund.

On the surface you think, well, there's the solution; nobody has to worry. If they lose a job, they're going to get money from this fund. If they might have lost their jobs, the employer can get money from this fund to keep them.

1710

It really is quite fascinating until you get further on in the next section, in part V, under subsection 14(3), where it relates to the fund. It's all about the payments and it says, “Subject to the regulations, the administrator shall make payments out of the fund to a bargaining unit employee who is released from employment by his or her employer if,” and there are four conditions under that “if.”

The one that I wanted to ask the parliamentary assistant about—I guess this administrator is some omnipotent god in the Bob Rae socialist organization in this province—is the one that says:

“(d) the administrator is satisfied that the bargaining

agent that has bargaining rights in respect of the employee made all reasonable efforts to enter into a local agreement with the employer to implement the sectoral framework."

In other words, this fund is not up to the people who really need it. The string is right in the hand of the administrator. I would like the parliamentary assistant to explain what exactly has to be done in order for "the administrator" to be satisfied. While you answer that question, Kimble, could you also say who the administrator is?

**Mr Sutherland:** I was under the impression that we're still dealing with sections 1 through 4. This question relates to section 14. I think it should be dealt with at the time when we get to section 14.

**The First Deputy Chair:** I thank the honourable member. Further questions on sections 1 to 4?

**Mrs Marland:** There's obviously no point in asking questions on sections 1 to 4, or probably any other section in this bill. I just asked a very legitimate question, and now the parliamentary assistant—it's unfortunate that the Minister of Finance had to leave, because I would be completely assured that he would have answered my question. The fact that you're now sitting in his place and you choose not to answer my question on some fairy-like excuse that it happens to be partly in one section and partly in another, infuriates me. The total process is a waste of time.

**Mr Phillips:** I go back to section 4. Frankly, we do have quite a few questions. As we said in some of our opening remarks, we think the bill has some real serious problems and I would hope this is an opportunity for us to raise the questions we've got, to point out to the people of Ontario where our concerns are, and in the final analysis, the people would judge who is right.

On section 4—in fairness to the minister, I must say I have no difficulty with him being out of the House right now; he indicated earlier to me that this was going to be what happened—this is an area of the bill that I think many people in the province will have real questions about.

I hope the parliamentary assistant can help me here. This provides to the minister enormous powers. Firstly, there is a \$400-million stick here. Call it what you will, but it is a stick. It is a \$400-million stick in the hands of the Minister of Finance which says, "Reach a sectoral agreement before August 1 or you lose \$400 million."

I would say to the parliamentary assistant, if any company negotiating with its employees used this kind of stick, I think the government would be all over it. If a private sector company said, "Listen, you've got till August 1 to reach an agreement with us or we take this away from you," that would be seen as bargaining in bad faith. But there's a \$400-million stick.

There's only one person, as I read this, who can

designate a plan as a sectoral agreement, and that is the minister, and this is what I was trying to get at earlier when the minister was here, about the enormous powers that I think are delegated here, but maybe the member can help me. It is only the minister who can designate a sectoral agreement; the sectoral agreements are worth \$400 million; if they don't reach the sectoral agreement, there's \$400 million added to the targets; "The minister shall not designate a plan as a sectoral framework unless, in the opinion of the minister, the plan meets the following criteria," and then there are five, I think, far-reaching criteria, that, as I read the bill, will have enormous impact on every single local agreement.

The government may feel comfortable with this because it will be its minister who's making this determination. I would say that it sets an enormous precedent for the future because I could see the possibility of future governments saying, "We're going to have another sectoral agreement with different criteria," and the NDP will be caught, because you've already agreed that these are acceptable ways of doing collective bargaining.

There are five very far-reaching criteria that will, as I say, impact every single local agreement. Then there are also in section 12, in part IV, another nine provisions that it says "may consider" in the framework. The first five have to be there; the next nine may be.

My question is this—because the minister, when he was here kind of said I was overreacting to the power of the minister, but I would just like the parliamentary assistant—is it right that it will be the minister and the minister alone who can agree on whether there is a sectoral agreement; are we talking about a \$400-million penalty here if people don't reach the sectoral agreement; and, can the parliamentary assistant comment on, if this were a private sector bargaining situation, would an employer be allowed to issue that kind of penalty against a deadline and not be charged with bargaining in bad faith?

**Mr Sutherland:** I think in response to the member's questions, the minister can designate plans according to the criteria, but if there are other optional criteria that have come together, that could still be considered appropriate.

**Mr Phillips:** I barely got the start of an answer, let alone an answer. Can I just go back over what I asked?

Firstly, can you confirm that it is the minister and the minister alone who can designate a sectoral framework; can you confirm or deny that there is a \$400-million total penalty here if there's not a sectoral agreement; and, can you confirm that all five of those criteria must be in the plan before the minister can designate the plan as a sectoral agreement?

**Mr Sutherland:** To your three questions: yes, yes and yes.



**Mr Phillips:** Then I would also appreciate an answer on the fourth question, and that is, if in the private sector we were dealing with collective agreements and a company chose to issue that kind of predetermined penalty against a time frame, would it be charged with bad-faith bargaining; and secondly, the minister, when he was responding to me earlier, and maybe you were here when he did, indicated that I was exaggerating the power that the minister had in this bill. What you've just confirmed to me is, it is the minister and the minister alone who will approve these sectoral agreements. There is a \$400-million penalty if people don't agree by August 1 to meet the Minister of Finance's edict and all five of these things must be in the plan, and for anyone who's looked at them, they are far-reaching. They are intrusions on local collective agreements beyond which we've ever seen.

1720

You may say, "Well, I'm happy about that," but they are intruding on 9,000 collective agreements, something that only the Minister of Finance has the authority to approve. In the final analysis, the Minister of Finance alone will determine whether or not a sectoral agreement meets his criteria and those criteria will impact every single collective agreement in the province, public sector agreement, impact dramatically.

The NDP government may think they like that right now. Maybe they think they like that. But the precedent you're setting here, where a future minister of whatever stripe, a Conservative minister, a Liberal minister or whatever stripe, you've set a bill here that will allow a future minister to set the financial criteria, to agree or not agree on these agreements and to impose those sectoral agreements on almost a million working people in the province of Ontario.

My question, if the member would go back to it once again for me, is, if this were in the private sector, would this be seen as bargaining in bad faith? How is it that the minister, when I asked him the question earlier, denied that this bill gave the minister sweeping new powers, and you've just confirmed for the people of Ontario that it does give the minister enormous powers to intrude in collective bargaining?

**Mr Sutherland:** I just want to clarify that the minister himself cannot impose a plan, but the plans, in order to be designated, need to meet the five criteria, in general need to meet the five criteria to be designated. But there is the one exception, if you look in subsection 11(4), special circumstances. It says:

"Subsection (3) does not apply to a plan if, in the opinion of the minister, special circumstances apply and it is desirable to designate the plan as a sectoral framework."

**Mr Phillips:** If you can help me on what sufficient support for the plan means. Does there have to be a majority of the parties involved, both a majority of the

employees and a majority of the employers, in that sector before the minister can designate sufficient support, or what are the criteria for sufficient support?

**Mr Sutherland:** I'm sorry, I can't give you an answer to that question at this time. We have to wait until the process develops and evolves a little more before we'd be able to give you a definite answer.

**Mr Phillips:** As I hope people who may be watching this debate are beginning to realize, we are essentially being asked to buy a bill that gives enormous powers to the Minister of Finance and we are getting no definition of how the minister's going to exercise that power. The minister, who is here, indicates disbelief on that, a very simple question.

Just so everyone knows, we're talking here about a three-year plan involving compensation in the province of \$43 billion a year; we're talking about a penalty, if you don't agree to this agreement, of \$400 million, and it will be the minister alone who will designate the plan.

We've asked the question, "What will the criteria be for determining if there is sufficient support for the plan?" The answer we get is: "You'll only find that out later. We can't tell you when you're voting on the bill what we mean by 'sufficient support' for the plan." Why would you want anyone to vote on a bill where it is that vague about how you're going to exercise your authority?

**Mr Sutherland:** I think sufficient support would have to be assessed on the basis of the circumstances in the sector and what can be worked out up until the August 1 time limit.

**Mr Phillips:** I'm going to stay on this a while longer. I said at the outset I was looking forward to the debate and I hoped it would be a long debate. As a side issue, I understand the government's planning to restrict the debate on this.

But what could be more fundamental to the bill than this, that is, would there ever be a situation where a group of employees were asked to participate in a collective agreement process, in collective bargaining, and then one says, "How do we make a determination of whether or not we're supporting this?" and the government essentially is saying, "We'll make that determination for you"?

There is no indication in here that there has to be an indication that half of all the employers and half of all the employees in the sector agree to it. It looks to me like we're buying a bill here where the minister and the minister alone is going to determine whether or not there is a sectoral agreement.

I actually can see the possibility in this case, and you can dissuade me of this, where a sectoral agreement could be reached—and tell me if I'm wrong here—where less than half of the employers involved in the sector haven't agreed to it and less than half of the

bargaining agents representing the employees haven't agreed to it, but where the minister says: "Too bad. I've determined there's a sectoral agreement."

Could you ever see a case where there is less than 50% support among the employee groups for this sectoral agreement, but yet the minister has designated it as a sectoral agreement?

**Mr Sutherland:** I think the member is dealing with a lot of theoretical circumstances at this stage. The purpose of what we're trying to do is to get the parties to come to the table and negotiate sectoral agreements that the majority of the parties will agree to. If that is the case, then I think the minister would be responding in a positive fashion.

**Mr Phillips:** I assume the third party would like some opportunity to comment as well, not to necessarily even wrap up this section because we may have to come back to it. But what you're asking the Legislature to do is to agree on a bill that in this case gives the Minister of Finance enormous powers.

The bill is passed and two or three weeks from now we find out the minister has approved sectoral agreements that may have very little support among the employers in that sector and among the employees in that sector. But the minister has chosen to designate that and to order that plan to be implemented.

We are not talking about minor matters here; we're talking about a fifth of all of the workers in the province, \$43 billion in payroll, and we're also talking of collective agreements and working arrangements that have been developed over decades.

I guarantee you, absolutely guarantee you that these sectoral agreements are going to impose fundamental change on the relationship between employers and employees sector by sector by sector. Yet we have no indication in the bill of how the minister is going to determine whether there is sufficient support for the plan in the sectors.

He may say, "Well, you'll just have to leave that to my good judgement, and you know that I've got good judgement, and surely you wouldn't think I would do anything that wouldn't be right." Well, I will say that there is no bargaining unit out there that would buy that. There's no bargaining unit that would say, "You determine for our members what's best for them." Actually, the whole bill is essentially the government saying: "We know best. We know best how to impose 9,000 collective agreements on a million people."

I go back to my concern and I ask the government once again, "Will you help us to get the answer to the question of how you're going to determine when there's sufficient support for the plan, so that all of those employers and employees out there don't find that we bought a plan that won't work."

**Mr Sutherland:** I don't think you can at this time

say there are general hard and fast rules. Obviously, though, if the majority on both sides were supporting that in a general sense, I think the minister would make a positive designation.

1730

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Chair, sections 1 to 4 have been moved. Is that correct?

**The First Deputy Chair:** I called for a discussion and we have continued to have discussion.

**Mrs Marland:** Okay. Now as long as the Liberals wish to stand up and discuss sections 1 to 4, we won't move out of sections 1 to 4. Is that correct?

**The First Deputy Chair:** That's correct.

**Mrs Marland:** That's the process we're into here in committee of the whole: As long as they wish to stand in this House and discuss anything in sections 1 to 4, we can be talking sections 1 to 4 from now until the time allocation motion kicks in and we're all out of time and we're down to the vote on third reading. We'll never get to any amendments. Is that correct?

**The First Deputy Chair:** It is up to the Chair to recognize any person who has questions, amendments or comments on sections 1 to 4.

**Mrs Marland:** I'm not criticizing the Chair at all. I'm simply confirming for the people who are watching this charade that they understand what's going on here. The point is that we do have constructive amendments to Bill 48. We are not happy at all in any sense of the word with Bill 48 as it is drafted and as it is presented here for committee of the whole today. But it is true that the Liberals can stand up and filibuster and go on and on and on and stay in sections 1 to 4.

They don't have any amendments to any sections of this bill, but they can keep us from reaching those sections where we do have constructive, remedial amendments by the very fact that every time they stand in this House, the Chair has to recognize them because that's the process in committee of the whole.

If that's the case, then we might as well get another question answered, because obviously the fact that the Liberals are choosing to monopolize the whole time this afternoon is not satisfactory to me, it's not satisfactory to any of my other colleagues here and I'm not about to yield the floor to the Liberals who had nothing to say on this bill at second reading except to vote against it. I'm not about to yield the floor now, in committee of the whole, and let them just use all the time that is left at our disposal to try to deal with this junk piece of legislation as it is printed and as it is presented in this House today. We can't even find out what the amendments are that the government wants to make to its own bill, recognizing the flaws in its own bill.

Dealing with part II, "Expenditure Reduction Targets," a very, very interesting subject, expenditure reduction targets at whose expense? I suggest at the



expense of the people who live and work and pay tax in this province.

Under part II, subsection 7(4) it says—and for those members of the government who are not following this at all, I noticed this afternoon, if you choose to get your bill out and you choose to follow the business of this House that's before you, you might be interested in turning to page 6 of the bill and then you might be able to follow with great interest and great commitment to the people of this province what is printed in this bill that you're going to come in and pass in this House.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Might I ask the honourable member a question first? The honourable member has just indicated some interest in page 6 and section 7, and with due respect, I just want to say that we still are on sections 1 to 4.

**Mrs Marland:** That's right, and this is actually section 2.

Under "expression of target" it says, "The minister may express an expenditure reduction target as a specific amount of money or by means of a formula or other method for determining an amount of money."

If you want examples of something that's pure bureaucratic gobbledegook, I would suggest that is the section, and I would like the—I don't know what riding the parliamentary assistant is from—

**Mr Stockwell:** Oxford.

**Mrs Marland:** I would like the member for Oxford, who is answering the questions or is supposed to be answering the questions at this point in this committee of the whole House, to try to explain what that means. What does it mean, "or by means of a formula or other method for determining an amount of money"? I haven't heard you answer any questions yet. We were doing very well with the Treasurer, but unfortunately, the Treasurer has a challenge this afternoon with his time schedule, which I respect.

But the problem is, you see, that the parliamentary assistant, as he is now doing, is leaning across his desk asking the staff to explain the section to him. I say with respect that if he doesn't know the answers, then we should have somebody sitting there who can explain this bill, because if this bill has to be interpreted by the public, I can tell you it's going to cost millions of dollars in lawyers' fees to get the interpretation of the bill, and that's without the regulations.

Wait till we get the policies and regulations that are behind this bill, those policies and regulations that we never get an opportunity to debate because they don't come before the floor; they don't come into this chamber for debate. So this is a section of the bill that I think must have come from Alice in Wonderland.

**Mr Sutherland:** It's just a way of saying that you may also do it by a specific percentage to reach the actual amount that you want to get at, or you may use

the actual money figure.

**Mrs Marland:** I have to say I beg your pardon. I didn't hear your last sentence as you were starting to sit. What was it that you said?

**Mr Sutherland:** What I was saying was that it either means you can use the specific dollar figure to get to the amount or they may want to work out some formula based on a percentage basis, and it's just to allow for that.

**Mrs Marland:** A percentage basis of what?

**Mr Sutherland:** It could be a combination of things. It may be a percentage of expenditures, it may be a percentage of grants etc or it may be a combination of those factors.

**Mr Phillips:** Could you be a little more vague?

1740

**Mrs Marland:** As the member has just said, perhaps the parliamentary assistant answering the question could be a little more vague and maybe we could understand.

You mentioned grants. We're talking here about the expression of targets. The target we're looking at is an expenditure reduction target. If you can't explain what an expenditure reduction target is, how do we expect the public sector employers and the partners, as you like to call them, the municipalities, the school boards, the police, the hospitals and the universities, all these partners that you want to be a part of your Bill 48; if you can't explain what an expenditure reduction target is under subsection (4) other than to use your mannerisms, which are visible but not in print—"It could be this, could be that, could be this, could be this, could be a formula or could be grants, whatever."

Could you give us a more clear answer to my question, so we don't have to hire lawyers to find a definition of what the answer is to that question? Or do you wish to have the latitude that you can individually interpret what the answer is; dealing with individuals, which makes it even more unjust?

**Mr Sutherland:** Let's be clear. The actual target amount will be set. The reference to formula is a question of how you're going to get to that, how you may achieve that target amount through a combination of the other things I had mentioned in my previous answer to you.

**Mrs Marland:** You just said the actual target will be set. Okay, then why do we have subsection (4) that says, "The minister may express an expenditure reduction target as a specific amount of money or by means of a formula or other method for determining an amount of money." I'm asking you, what is the other method?

**Mr Sutherland:** The section is in there to provide flexibility. There is no other specific method developed at this time, but there may be one that does come about. It's just to provide flexibility.

**Mrs Marland:** Oh, now we're starting to get to the short strokes here: "It may be something else determined at another time." That certainly gives a lot of confidence and a lot of security to the people who are going to be impacted by this legislation. What you're saying is that you don't have the answer: "It may be determined at another time." That answer is not acceptable. It is not good enough for this government to bring in legislation and then say "something to be determined in the future," some other method, something else it may need to pull out of a hip pocket somewhere down the line.

Why do you print it if you don't know what it is? If you don't have an explanation for what it is, why is it there? It's printed in your bill. If your answer is, "Maybe it's something for another time," then I would suggest to you, maybe this whole bill is something for another time. What do you mean by another time?

**Mr Sutherland:** I will try and respond once more. As I said, up until this point it's all been expressed in terms of an actual monetary amount, an actual amount of money to be found in savings. It may come, as a result of negotiations between the parties, that they may want to have it expressed in a different way. All it does is allow for the flexibility to have it expressed in that different way.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Further questions and comments?

*Interjection.*

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** I'll be brief so the honourable member can ask a question as well.

To the parliamentary assistant, in section 1 of the bill, "The purposes of this act are as follows," 3 says, "To provide for expenditure reduction for a three-year period and to provide criteria and mechanisms for achieving the reductions."

I wonder if you could explain. One of the concerns that has been expressed about this part is that a number of the reductions are going to be deferred; for example, for those who can't take their 12-day unpaid leave, that will be put off until after the three-year period. Can you tell us how that is going to be dealt with? It would seem we're going to have to pay a lot more after April 1996 for those people who—what is it? I think they're in emergency services or perhaps teachers, that kind of thing.

Is it correct, first of all, that there will be deferred costs that will be beyond this period of three years? Could you answer that one?

**Mr Sutherland:** It may occur. It doesn't necessarily say that it absolutely will occur, only in those areas as critical services. But I want to also say that it may be more appropriate to have the question asked under section 26, which deals more specifically with the question he is raising.

**Mr Beer:** I asked the question under the purposes because it seems to me that's a rather critical point. I guess I ask it as well because it's hard to know whether we will ever get to that section. I know there are a number of questions on these first four parts.

Can I ask the parliamentary assistant, what categories are they talking about in terms of those services that would be provided? What groups of people would not be able to use their 12 days so that that would be put off? Have you done any study of what the cost of that would be? For example, if you're a municipality and you're responsible for firefighters or, in the case of school boards, for teachers, how do you see all of that being paid for when presumably, from your answer to my first question, there may well be—that's what you said, but I think it's clear that there would be—a whole series of expenditures that transfer payment agencies would have to make after March 31, 1996?

**Mr Sutherland:** The actual regulation defining what the critical services specifically will be has not been finalized yet, so we can't give you a definite list, but you could probably get an idea by reading the act, and what areas have been identified to be covered would give you some sense of it, anyway.

**Mr Stockwell:** If you haven't defined what "critical" is, how do you know how many days are going to be deferred and the costs thereof allotted?

**Mr Sutherland:** Because we have a fail-safe provision in the actual act, you don't have to necessarily define all that to be able to achieve savings. Obviously, there will be some attempt, as much as possible, but there's still the fail-safe mechanism to ensure you'll reach your targets.

**Mr Stockwell:** That wasn't the question. The question was, if you haven't determined who's critical and who then can defer their pay pause days, how do you know how much money that's going to cost municipalities and your partners? The question's very clear. You don't have a critical list; therefore, you can't determine how many pay pause days can be deferred; and therefore, you don't understand the impact three years down the road.

**Mr Sutherland:** I think the member's correct. You may not know that information right now, but I think as the process goes on—or it may come out of negotiations that that would be established as to what the amount might be.

1750

**Mr Stockwell:** Isn't that rather critical? You're sitting here or standing in your place today suggesting we don't know who's critical, we don't know how much will be deferred, we don't even know the impact of the cost, yet you're claiming to save \$2 billion a year. What if after three years you've just deferred \$3 billion? What have you served in this piece of legislation? Where's the benefit if you defer \$3 billion?



**Mr Sutherland:** Having that list established, in terms of what critical is, is not absolutely necessary while negotiations are going on, people working out sectoral agreements and local deals.

**Mr Stockwell:** Let me be more direct. It's not critical. I don't know anyone who doesn't think it's critical. It's very critical to know who can take the pay pause days and who can't. Is a cop critical? In Metropolitan Toronto we've got 5,000 of them. Can't they take their pay pause days?

Let's figure out the payroll for the Metropolitan Toronto Police. The impact on Metropolitan Toronto will be in the neighbourhood of \$100 million in pay pause days. If we work it out across the board and you determine these people are all critical—and according to Metropolitan Toronto staff, they assume 58% of their employees are critical—you don't think that's an important number to know, about how much money you're saving? I can't believe that.

**Mr Sutherland:** At this stage I can't give the member any more answer than I've given him already.

**Mr Stockwell:** You can't give me any more. You haven't given me any. You haven't even got half a glass of water here.

You can't tell us who's critical, you can't tell us who's going to defer their pay pause day, you can't tell us how much money is going to be deferred, but you're telling us to accept this. Municipalities claiming up to 58% of their employee base is critical. They're going to defer 58% of their pay pause days and in essence be faced with potentially as much as a \$3-billion expense at the end of three years. Explain to me how you don't think that's important.

**Mr Sutherland:** They are issues that are to be dealt with within the sectoral agreements and to try to be resolved in that negotiation process in the different sectors.

**Mr Stockwell:** The answer is insane. Think about it. You're going to go into negotiations with people and everybody who determines that they're not critical—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm trying to ask the question and Mr Durham Dump is not in his seat, so, Mr Chair, I would appreciate if you could stop him from heckling.

You're going to go into negotiations. You're not going to know who's critical. Doesn't it make sense to you that everyone who comes to that table is going to be pleading and begging with their employer, "Call me critical, because if you do call me critical, I don't have to lose a nickel in pay," and you don't have any savings in this \$2-billion apparent fiasco.

The question stands: If you can't determine who's critical, don't you think that these partners' employees will come to the table all claiming to be critical and not losing a nickel of pay? Can't you see that being the case?

**Mr Sutherland:** As I said in my previous answer, at the sectoral negotiations the analysis will be done and those issues will be put forward. The member is probably correct that some groups may try and have themselves designated critical when they're not, but I would assume that many of the employers at the table may not agree to having them designated that way and they'll have to negotiate that based on the analysis put forward at the time.

**Mr Stockwell:** This is crazy. You've set down the legislation. You're the ones calling them critical. You won't tell them who's critical. You're going to tell them to go and negotiate that. Now they're going to try and negotiate an agreement that if they are correct and 58% of their employees are critical, they've simply deferred their payroll for nearly two thirds of their staff for three years.

I want to get right to the point here. You're telling me that we should pass this piece of legislation without any knowledge of who's critical and who's not, without any knowledge of how much money can be saved and what can't, without any knowledge of how much money we're going to defer for three years and without any knowledge of exactly what saving is involved for the taxpayer. Is that what you're trying to say?

**Mr Sutherland:** What I'm saying to you in response is that a list of who is critical will be developed, and it will be developed before August 1.

**Mr Stockwell:** There are a million items that you can go on in here, but this to me is probably one of the most fundamental. Why it is the most fundamental, and I put this to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance, is if you're going through all this pain, all this trouble and all this work, it would seem to me that you'd want to know you're going to collect or do away with the \$2 billion you're talking about.

Now, if you're saying to me you cannot supply a list of what's critical, would you, as parliamentary assistant, at least accept this: that if you determine ambulance service, firefighters, police, day care workers, senior citizens' buildings, health care, nurses, hospitals, teachers, all those positions are critical, it really in fact takes whatever benefit you have out of your legislation. Would you not agree with that?

**Mr Sutherland:** I think, to help the situation, it's important to understand how it will work for those who are designated critical. Their holidays and vacations during this period in many cases may be unpaid, and then after the period they would get days off to make up for that. So you still should be able to achieve the saving.

**Mr Stockwell:** I want to ask this one last question.

**The First Deputy Chair:** One last question for the honourable member.

**Mr Stockwell:** You're suggesting to me in your

answer that these officials would bank their holidays, then come 1996 they would be allowed to take holidays. What gives you that impression, if they can't afford to take one day a month off for the next three years, they would be able to take three weeks successively off after 1996? It makes no sense if they can't get the time off during the three-year period that they be able to get time off afterwards. What kind of warped, distorted, backwoods logic is that?

**Mr Sutherland:** I think the member for Etobicoke West is trying to imply that after this three-year period is up, all these days off would be taken at once. Obviously, they'll still have to be worked out so that services can still be provided.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I move that the committee of the whole rise and report.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Mrs Boyd has moved that the committee of the whole rise and report. All those in favour of the motion.

**Mrs Marland:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I understand this House sits until 6 o'clock, so why is the motion being made at four minutes to 6?

**The First Deputy Chair:** Because there is further business to do before 6 o'clock.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

The committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I would like to announce the business of the coming week.

On Monday, July 5, we will continue committee of the whole consideration of Bill 48, the Social Contract Act.

On Tuesday, July 6, we will give third reading consideration to Bill 48.

On Wednesday, July 7, we will continue the adjourned second reading debate of the Ontario Loan Act, Bill 25, followed by the adjourned second reading debate of Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act.

On Thursday, July 8, during private members' public business, we will consider ballot item number 19 in the name of Mr Lessard and ballot item number 20, second reading of Bill 57, standing in the name of Mr Sorbara. On Thursday afternoon, we will give third reading consideration to Bill 25, the Ontario Loan Act, followed by the adjourned second reading debate of Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Dennis Drainville):** It now being precisely 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until next Monday, July 5, at 1:30 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1800.











# CONTENTS

Wednesday 30 June 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Day care</b>	
Mr Offer	2113
<b>Special services at home program</b>	
Mr Arnott	2113
<b>International Freedom Festival</b>	
Mr Dadamo	2113
<b>Special investigations unit</b>	
Mr Ruprecht	2114
<b>GO rail expansion</b>	
Mr Harnick	2114
<b>Heritage legislation</b>	
Mr Gary Wilson	2114
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Caplan	2114
<b>Boating safety</b>	
Mr McLean	2115
<b>Senior citizens' housing</b>	
Mrs Mathysen	2115

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

<b>Contaminated soil</b>	
Mr Charlton	2116
Mr Curling	2116
Mr Offer	2117
Mr Tilson	2117

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2118
Mr Laughren	2118
<b>Race relations</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2119
Mrs Boyd	2119
<b>Tax increases</b>	
Mr Cousens	2121
Mr Laughren	2121
<b>First ministers' meeting</b>	
Mr Eves	2122
Mr Laughren	2122
Mr Bradley	2122

## Interprovincial trade

Mr Sterling	2123
Mr Laughren	2123

## Rouge Valley

Mr Wiseman	2123
Mr Hampton	2123

## Jobs Ontario Training fund

Mrs McLeod	2124
Mr Cooke	2124
Ms Poole	2124

## Gambling

Mr Eves	2125
Ms Churley	2125

## Automobile insurance

Ms Carter	2125
Mr Charlton	2125

## Tendering process

Mr Daigeler	2126
Mr Pouliot	2126

## Forest industry

Mr Jordan	2126
Mr Hampton	2126

## PETITIONS

### Education financing

Mr Eddy	2127
---------	------

### Health care

Mr Murdoch	2128
------------	------

### Mental health services

Mr Malkowski	2128
--------------	------

### Closure of agricultural college

Mrs Fawcett	2128
-------------	------

### Gambling

Mr Arnott	2128
-----------	------

### Automobile insurance

Mrs Haslam	2128
Mr Wiseman	2129

### Bruce generating station

Mr Elston	2129
-----------	------

### Produce-your-own beer and wine

Mr Jordan	2129
Mr Murdoch	2130

### Retail store hours

Mr Eddy	2129
---------	------

## Seniors' health services

Mr Jim Wilson	2129
Mr Elston	2130

## Parole system

Mr O'Connor	2130
-------------	------

## Child care

Mr Owens	2130
----------	------

## Seniors' health services

Mr Elston	2130
-----------	------

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### Standing committee on regulations and private bills

Ms Haeck	2131
----------	------

### Standing committee on social development

Mr Eddy	2131
---------	------

## ROYAL ASSENT

The Lieutenant Governor	2131
-------------------------	------

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

### Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48

Mr Laughren	2132, 2134, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2143
-------------	---------------------------------------

Mrs McLeod	2132
------------	------

Mr Cousens	2133, 2134
------------	------------

Mr Phillips	2136, 2148, 2149
-------------	------------------

Mrs Marland	2138, 2139, 2140, 2147, 2150
-------------	---------------------------------

Mr Offer	2140, 2141, 2146
----------	------------------

Mr Stockwell	2141, 2152
--------------	------------

Mr Mahoney	2143
------------	------

Mr Sutherland	2149, 2151
---------------	------------

Mr Beer	2152
---------	------

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Visitors

The Speaker	2115
Mr Cleary	2115

### Business of the House

Mrs Boyd	2154
----------	------

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 30 juin 1993

## SANCTION ROYALE

Le lieutenant-gouverneur	2131
--------------------------	------



c/2w  
21  
-023  
No. 42



N° 42

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 5 July 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 5 juillet 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Monday 5 July 1993

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### LOU PARSONS

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I'd like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the members of this House and the people of Ontario, to thank Lou Parsons, whose term as chairman of GO Transit has not been renewed by Bob Rae.

Mr Parsons, who is a resident of Mississauga, has served as chairman of GO Transit for the past 13 years. He's a knowledgeable and hardworking businessman who applied his business acumen to running GO Transit. The result was a well-run transit system that has served the people of the greater Toronto area well.

We all recognize that this is a political appointment. Mr Parsons was first appointed by Premier Davis in 1980, but he took his appointment very seriously. He applied his business knowledge to the smooth operation and development of a first-class transit system in Ontario, and he did so in a non-partisan way.

In 1990, Premier Peterson recognized the fine job Lou Parsons was doing. He understood that his first responsibility was to the people of Ontario and he reappointed Mr Parsons.

If I could offer some advice to Bob Rae, and the way things are going he could use advice from any quarter these days, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Lou Parsons has shown class in accepting the Premier's decision. Bob Rae has shown that he is simply running out of jobs for NDP hacks.

Lou may lose this job, but the people of Ontario are losing a loyal servant who has transcended partisan politics to do a superb job as chairman of GO Transit. Lou Parsons has served this province well and I congratulate him and extend my best wishes to him in his future endeavours.

##### ONTARIO FILM REVIEW BOARD

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I call on the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to hold a public inquiry into the operations and mandate of the Ontario Film Review Board, for the following reasons:

First, the OFRB fails to reflect community standards when classifying adult sex videos. The chair of the board received hundreds of letters protesting the board's plans to loosen the guidelines for what is allowed in these videos.

Second, the board does not consider public input. When the board met to consider the guideline changes, only a couple of these hundreds of letters of protest

were distributed. The chair of the board treats the public with contempt, calling her critics fascists.

Third, the board's first, direct service is to the distributors, while it's second, indirect service is to the public. This is an unacceptable mandate for a government agency.

Fourth, it is the board's legal opinion that the OFRB is not required to apply the criminal law test of obscenity. How ridiculous, when violent and degrading pornography has been linked to increased violence against women and children. If every citizen is expected not to commit a criminal act, then the OFRB can be expected to apply the criminal law test of obscenity.

Public hearings into the OFRB must occur before the board's planned review of its guidelines for violence in films and videos. Our society's safety and wellbeing are at stake.

##### CANADA DAY

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** There was warm sunshine, a party mood and smiles on thousands of faces as people jammed Optimist Recreation Park on Dorchester Road in Niagara Falls for Canada Day. Nearly every group in the city was there to provide music and many activities. To quote the Review, "More than 10,000 people shook the recession blues and turned out for a gala birthday party, many wearing patriotic red and white."

I want to thank the organizers of this event and congratulate all those receiving good citizenship awards.

The theme of the opening ceremonies honoured the 200th anniversary of the anti-slavery legislation in Upper Canada. This was enacted July 9, 1793, in nearby Niagara-on-the-Lake, then known as Newark. This was 40 years before the British Emancipation Act and 70 years before the US.

We can certainly be proud of the principles on which our country is based. We must now show that women, visible minorities, aboriginal people and disabled are in fact equal and valuable members of the workforce as well as in our society.

In Niagara Falls, we have the unique pleasure each day of reaching out to people from around the world who visit our world-famous falls and showing our hospitality. I invite everyone listening to also enjoy the beauty of the falls this summer. Something new has been added this year, every Friday night at 11 pm, fireworks over the falls. What could be more romantic?

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orillia):** Today, Bill 48's debate will continue in committee of the whole, yet no one, including the Conservatives, seems to understand the Tory position on the legislation. On the television

show Focus Ontario, Mike Harris said, and I quote—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mrs Caplan:** —his caucus “very likely won’t support” the social contract legislation “on third reading.”

I hope this means that the Tories are starting to see the light and are listening to me. The original Conservative view was bang, bang, bang. “We’ll support your legislation,” Harris told Premier Rae. Then the Tory caucus said Bill 48 is bad, bad, bad legislation.

By voting in favour of Bill 48 during second reading, the Conservative caucus gave the social contract legislation credibility it simply did not deserve. I hope the Tories have finally realized that no amendments can fix this flawed legislation.

I say to the Conservative caucus, stop adding confusion to the chaos. Stop the maybes, the ifs, ands or buts, the very likelys or perhapses. Tell the people of Ontario that you will not support Bill 48, that no amendments can possibly fix this bill, and join Lyn McLeod and the Liberal caucus in defeating Bill 48 and this government. Vote with us on third reading against Bill 48.

1340

#### RACE RELATIONS

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** On June 6, the Jewish National Fund of Canada, Hamilton branch, held its annual Negev dinner to honour the achievements of Gerald Swaye, an outstanding Canadian, and his deep commitment to the people of Israel and our community.

The Jewish National Federation is worthy of the strongest possible support by all Canadians. Now that the same kind of terrorism the people of Israel have had to live with is beginning to show its ugly face here on our continent, we realize that Israel’s battle is ours as well and that what Israel suffers is what we must all share in.

We have been witness to an alarming rise of anti-Semitism, especially here in Ontario. Last December, it took eight days for a swastika painted on the side of the Legislature to be removed. Recently, skinheads broke into a Kitchener store and viciously attacked an elderly Jew. Ernst Zundel has already received too much notoriety in the press, while we are informed that not enough evidence exists to put a stop to it.

In times like these, we as legislators must become more vigilant against anti-Semitism. If our laws against it aren’t strong enough, then we must strengthen them, along with our commitment and our resolve. To do nothing is to condone anti-Semitism by our silence and our inaction. If not us, then whom? If not now, then when? Now is the time to send a clear message that anti-Semitism will not be tolerated, not in this province,

not in this country, not anywhere.

On behalf of the Ontario PC Party, I congratulate Gerald Swaye and I renew our pledge as legislators to the entire Jewish community to oppose all forms of racial and religious hatred everywhere.

New year in Jerusalem.

#### BUFFALO DAYS

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I’d like to extend an invitation to all the members of the Legislature, their families and their friends to a celebration in my riding which is called Buffalo Days. It’s going to be a celebration from July 14 to 18. It is in Ridgetown, the friendliest town in Ontario.

There are a lot of activities going on, such things as a golf tournament, buffalo foods, a tour of a buffalo farm which is in my riding, and also a tennis tournament, pony rides, a blacksmith demonstration, barn-raising, street dancing and lots of music. There are many other activities.

The town of Ridgetown is situated in the agricultural heartland of southwestern Ontario and it offers visitors a comfortable and relaxing atmosphere. It’s located close to Lake Erie and Rondeau Provincial Park, which provides excellent fishing, bird-watching, swimming from long stretches of sandy beach and also camping facilities. You can take a walk along our picturesque main street and experience Ridgetown’s combination of rural charm and urban vitality.

I know I only have a minute and a little bit, but I’d like to certainly extend the invitation to people to come and join the celebration of Buffalo Days. If you can’t make it this time, drop in any time.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** The government’s social contract legislation is causing much confusion, deep concern and even hopelessness in hundreds of small and rural municipalities throughout Ontario. Elected and appointed municipal officials of many of the smaller municipalities throughout Ontario are in a quandary more serious than ever before because of the requirements of this provincial government’s so-called social contract.

Several hundred Ontario municipalities have few, if any, employees earning over \$30,000 per annum. If a municipality has no employee earning over \$30,000, or only one, or even a few, how can it bear the government’s forced reduction without reducing or indeed eliminating services?

I compliment the many, many municipalities of the province that have already, in a concerted effort to bring in budgets with zero mill rate increases, and in some cases, several years in a row, reduced services, reduced expenditures, reduced staff, held the line on staff salaries, wages and benefits, and reduced precious reserve funds.



How can these hard-pressed municipalities cope with the government's social contract requirements? This government must end the constant confusion that is created with its muddling-through approach to financial management and must open up the communication lines.

#### SIMCOE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** The Simcoe County Board of Education is facing budget cuts of more than \$12 million as part of the NDP government's so-called social contract. The board recognizes and accepts the need to reduce the cost to present and future taxpayers in Simcoe county, but the board is also looking for recognition of the fact that cost-cutting measures have already been undertaken by the Simcoe County Board of Education.

The board trimmed \$4.9 million during the 1993 budget deliberations, and that is expected to have an impact of \$9.3 million on the 1994 budget. As part of the reduction program, the board has managed to obtain a reduction in hours worked; wage packages; staff, through attrition and retirement; and the plant maintenance budget.

The board had originally budgeted for a \$2.4-million restructuring grant from the province, and then the Treasurer turned around and chopped \$2 million from that original \$2.4 million. The Simcoe County Board of Education now faces the unpleasant possibility of slashing a further \$12 million without ever getting credited for the proactive approach it has taken in its recent budgetary policies.

The Minister of Education and Training must give the board the opportunity to demonstrate how cost reductions have already been achieved and to make its case that the Simcoe county board should be recognized as meeting the requirements of the social contract. The minister has an obligation to ensure that some flexibility is built into the Social Contract Act. Be positive, not like the bang, bang, bang of the member for Oriole.

#### CANADA'S POTENTIAL

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I want to share part of an editorial that appeared in the Canadian Statesman, a well-known and respected newspaper in my riding. This is what they said:

"Canada has made yet another birthday. But is there anything left to celebrate? It depends, we suppose, on whether you are an optimist or a pessimist. Factories continue to close, farmers can't get a decent price for their crops, and droves of middle managers are finding their jobs on the chopping block."

If you are pessimistic, like my friends across the way, you will see little to cheer about. But if you're an optimist like I am, you will see that this country, despite recent setbacks, remains full of potential.

We are a nation of greatness. We have first-class health care, excellent educational opportunities and

talent abounding in sports and the arts. We have freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom of association. Everything we need for success—

#### *Interjections.*

**Mr Mills:** Mr Speaker, they're hounding me unmercifully. Everything we need for success is right before our eyes. We seem to spend more time listening to self-appointed proclaimers of doom. It's time to pick up the pieces and get back to work building this country up rather than tearing it down. Above all, I appeal to everyone in here: Let's all be optimists.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to welcome to our assembly this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, Mr Ernest Smith, MLA, Legislative Assembly, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Mr Jean-Robert Gauthier, Member of Parliament, Mr Eugène Bellemare, Member of Parliament, and Mr Richard Dominique, all from the House of Commons, Ottawa. We are joined as well by M. Jean-François Gauthrin, MNA, Mme Louise Harel, MNA, and Ms Line Béland from the National Assembly, Quebec. In addition, Mr Fred Gingell, MLA, British Columbia; Mr Len Evans, MLA, Manitoba; Mr Neil Windsor, MHA, Newfoundland; Mr Danny Dumaesque, MHA, Newfoundland; Mr Brent Taylor, MLA, New Brunswick; Loredana Catalli Sonier, Newfoundland; Mr Henry Zoe, MLA, Northwest Territories, and Mr Alan Downe, Northwest Territories.

Please join me in welcoming all of our guests to our assembly.

1350

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My questions will be for the Premier. Day after day, we have raised our concerns about Bill 48, the government's social contract legislation. Our concerns are real, they continue to be real, even though we receive no answers, and every day brings us new questions about this legislation.

We have consistently raised our concerns that this bill does not achieve restraint in the short term, and we are deeply concerned that in fact this bill simply defers significant costs to some government in a future day. The legislation has created an unprecedented atmosphere of confusion and confrontation and even has led to divisions within the Premier's own caucus and cabinet. We have continuously suggested alternatives because we believe there is a better way to meet the goals of restraint, and this Premier has refused to listen.

I say to the Premier, surely you understand that you have gone to the wall for flawed legislation that will not achieve any of your own goals. Do you not care that you have set up a ticking time bomb that is going to

lead to billions of costs for future governments? Do you not care that three weeks after your legislation was introduced, there are still no meaningful negotiations to achieve your financial targets for this year? Why do you refuse to look honestly at the implications of this disastrous legislation that you've brought forward?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I particularly appreciated the Leader of the Opposition's concern about the state of health of my caucus and party. These are the kinds of well wishes that even Job could have wished for.

I would say to the honourable member very directly that, first of all, there are a number of negotiations that are under way, I will have the member know. Those negotiations are proving to be very productive and they are going to prove to be ultimately successful in a great many sectors. That's a fact.

Secondly, I would say to the honourable member that her view that this bill is one that simply defers costs is not our view. That's not the purpose of what we're doing. It's not the purpose of the legislation. It's not the purpose of what's in place. We are going through a period of adjustment in the province in which the size of the public sector and the size of public sector compensation is going to have to come down.

The honourable members says she's made a number of useful suggestions with respect to how one could produce restraint. I haven't heard one suggestion from the leader of the Liberal Party with respect to the issue of public sector compensation. I haven't heard her say a peep about the compensation of doctors. I haven't heard her say a peep about the compensation of anyone else working in the public sector. I haven't heard her say a word. I haven't her say boo on the subject of how you would arrive at this. All she does is go around to the municipalities and everyone else and say: "Oh, don't touch me. Don't touch him. Don't touch me. Don't touch the person behind the tree." That's the position of the Liberal Party of Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** It's a classic of the oldest of old politics, and it won't work in the new Ontario. It won't work.

**Mrs McLeod:** Still no answers to questions which are clearly unanswerable. At the very least, the Premier should have checked Hansard from last week, when his own Finance minister at least acknowledged that the issue of deferred cost was indeed an issue, although he personally didn't think it was a problem because he thought our calculations of the cost were somewhat excessive. I say to the Premier that even with the amendments that were brought forward last week, there are more questions that are being raised.

And when you say, Premier, that we have not given any alternatives, I take you back to the end of March,

when we said: "Bring in your financial targets. Negotiate with your own employees to achieve those targets. Let other public sector employers and employees do the same thing." That would have worked, Premier, and it would still work.

But instead of that, we find that last week, in an attempt to somehow appease or amend this flawed legislation, you introduced an amendment to section 33 of the bill. This amendment seems to provide for the unilateral extension of existing collective agreements until 1996, although apparently only for those groups that have the right to strike.

I realize that this may seem like a somewhat technical question, but it has very great significance. It would seem to us that while employers are still hoping to work out local solutions, those local solutions that we believe could be found to achieve restraint through the negotiating process, your amendment is going to tie their hands.

Premier, I ask you to help us understand this amendment to section 33. Why is it there? Who does it apply to? What is it meant to do? How do you expect people at the local level to be able to work out long-term solutions to restraint while you stifle the collective bargaining process?

**Hon Mr Rae:** We're not stifling the collective bargaining process. You asked me, what's the purpose of the amendment? The purpose of the amendment is to deal with the very real concern that exists that because of the application of the law and because of the climate of restraint in which we're working, where there will not be, by definition, bargaining over wages for a period of time—the concern has been expressed that this will therefore allow employers in some instances, in some cases, where there's great inequality of bargaining power, to effectively go in and totally gut the collective agreement, which is what we don't want to have happen.

So we're putting forward that proposal as a way of ensuring that important contract language, that important issues that have been there for some time cannot simply be taken away unilaterally by the employer.

**Mrs McLeod:** The nightmare of this legislation just keeps getting more and more bizarre. Under Bill 48, this government is clearly prepared to override every single collective agreement in the public sector in this province, and now the Premier says they have brought in an amendment in the name of somehow protecting collective agreements. But those are the same collective agreements they have already unilaterally interfered with by the fail-safe, broad-brush provisions which build in their own inequities, and the amendment itself actually suspends the collective bargaining process unilaterally.

It seems that out of the total confusion this creates, I can find only one clear question. Why is it that unilateral changes that you propose as government to collec-



tive agreements are somehow okay, but you want to stop people at the local level from trying to negotiate restraint measures that work through their own collective bargaining processes?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Nothing could be further from the truth. What we want to do is to allow bargaining to take place in which both sides are working from a basis of mutual respect and in which there can be successful bargaining at the local level, and what we're looking for is successful bargaining at the local level.

The whole premise of our approach has been to ensure that people, within a framework that ensures a certain protection, are able to bargain successfully locally. That's the whole premise of the approach.

#### COMMERCIAL CONCENTRATION TAX

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** With a certain amount of reluctance, I turn in my second question to another disastrous piece of legislation. In this case, it was a piece of legislation which ironically we had hoped to be able to support, because I think the Premier is well aware that we were prepared to support the removal of the commercial concentration tax. In fact, we wanted to see that measure instituted as soon as possible, and we wanted to support a bill which contained this measure specifically.

The Premier will also know that Bill 29, which stands in the name of the commercial concentration tax, also contains amendments to 12 other acts, many of which are totally unrelated in any way to the commercial concentration tax and which are extremely significant in their own right and which require debate and examination.

We will ensure our support for the swift passage of the repeal of the commercial concentration tax if you will allow us to deal with other parts of Bill 29 in a fair and democratic manner. I ask, will you support the commercial concentration tax sections of this bill so that this House can pass the repeal of that tax measure without delay?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'm sorry to have made the life of the official opposition so very difficult. Having brought in the commercial concentration tax, having argued in favour of it, having brought it in, having imposed it on the greater Toronto area, they now want to have the opportunity to do their mea culpa, and somehow, for some reason, they feel we've taken it away from them. I'm very sorry for the Leader of the Opposition. Sometimes life is a little bit hard.

1400

**Mrs McLeod:** I think it's unfortunate that the Premier has chosen this particular issue on which to provide a purely flippant response, because I can assure the Premier that in raising this question, we are raising an issue which we believe is fundamental to the integrity of the democratic process as well as to the openness

of this government.

I draw the Premier's attention to just one of the sections of Bill 29 which happens to be of particular concern to us, section 12, and section 12 gives this government tremendous power to make decisions about the Ontario drug benefit plan. It gives the government the power to decide on everything from what drugs will be on the plan to whether there will be user fees for seniors.

The Premier will surely be aware that for the past three years his government has actually been working with pharmacists towards a joint consultative committee so that jointly, with professional and objective advice, there can be a determination of the most cost-efficient way of providing pharmaceutical care to the people of this province. Now, just as you did with Bill 50, you have thrown the process out and all of the work that had been done. You have done it with no consultation and in fact you have done it without notice.

I ask the Premier, can you tell me, firstly, why have you done this and, secondly, why have you done it in this way? Why have you tried to sneak in major changes to our health care system through the back door?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The idea that something has been snuck in, the idea first of all that this government could successfully sneak in anything, given the current climate and reality—talk about trying to sneak something in—I spoke about the subject of drug reform and debated it in an open forum at Toronto city hall last week, so this isn't exactly something we're trying to keep under the carpet.

We are dealing directly with the commercial concentration tax, we're dealing directly with the problem of drug expenditure, we're dealing directly with the problem of public sector compensation, we're dealing directly with the question of expenditure reduction. You want to play political games saying, "Premier, you've taken away my chance to cherry-pick your legislation." You can't cherry-pick; you have to make up your mind. Are you in favour of taking these measures or aren't you? If you're opposed, fine, stand opposed, because that's what the Liberal Party's been standing for for the last two years. "No, no, no, no, no." That's been your position.

**Mrs McLeod:** Obviously, it's "My terms or no terms; our health system or no health care system. Do it our way, people of Ontario, or you won't get the service at all."

I simply cannot believe that the Premier doesn't understand how betrayed the professional pharmacists of this province feel at the total abandonment, without notice, of the consultation process that they were genuinely working towards.

I say to the Premier that there are two issues here.

The first is that once again this government is taking unto itself unilateral powers to decide what is medically necessary for the people of this province, and that is intolerable.

The second issue is that this time you have indeed tried to do it through the back door under a piece of legislation that is called the commercial concentration tax, and that is indefensible.

This bill gives this government unprecedented powers and I say to the Premier that you cannot take these kind of draconian measures without full public debate, without full committee hearings so that the people of this province can understand the full implications of what this government is doing.

I ask you once again, will you separate the commercial concentration tax from the rest of the bill so that we can act on that measure quickly, and will you then allow us to have full and open airing of this government's continued attempts to unilaterally and arbitrarily direct our health care system?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The short answer to the question is no. A slightly expanded answer has to do with the fact that it is not at all unusual for a government, as a result of a budget, to bring forth a measure that contains a number of the proposals that are contained in the budget. For her to suggest, and if she wants me to go back and look at the budgets of her predecessor which she was ready to stand up and support, "Ready, aye, ready," she now wants a chance—

#### *Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** She was there standing in her place in favour of the commercial concentration tax. Now she wants a chance to do her flip. Let her do her flip. And if she's not prepared to do her flip because she can't deal with the pressure from the pharmacists or anyone else, well, I'm sorry; I can't help her.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. Throughout the social contract process we have offered encouragement and support for your efforts to cut the size and cost of government. Premier, you would know that we have concerns that it be permanent cuts in the size and cost of government.

We have offered advice. We have, as you are aware, offered alternatives, and last week tabled amendments that would make the restraint legislation itself fairer and which would not leave any financial onus, if you like, on successive governments after the control period ends.

But, Premier, we were a little shocked on Wednesday when we found out that you intend to arbitrarily bring an end to debate on the social contract legislation without allowing us to debate all our amendments. So, Premier, for everyone in Ontario who is counting on our amendments, could you tell us if you have any intention of giving serious consideration to those amendments?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I refer it to the Minister of Finance.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I did appreciate the serious attempt by the Conservative caucus to make some amendments to the legislation, as opposed to the official opposition, who decided to bail out of the process entirely.

I've looked at each one of the amendments which the Conservative caucus has brought forward and it was my hope that we would have been able to get to the various sections that included the Conservative caucus's amendments. We have some government amendments as well, and there are one or two that are of particular interest to me.

That is why I was somewhat dismayed on Wednesday that we didn't get anywhere last Wednesday afternoon, didn't get anywhere on the debate, that the opposition simply debated sections 1 through 4 and didn't get to any conclusion whatsoever. It's very difficult to get to deal with your amendments if we're not making progress on the bill. I certainly don't feel any responsibility for not getting to the amendments that you've brought forward.

**Mr Harris:** Treasurer, the social contract legislation needs work; we all know that. Less than an hour into committee of the whole discussion, you tabled the closure motion. Less than an hour was spent on a very substantial bill, a bill that you and your officials acknowledge was hastily drafted and has flaws.

Treasurer, we've received countless phone calls, just for one example, and letters from small municipalities and school boards which say they cannot meet their reduction targets without layoffs because so few on their payroll make over \$30,000. The Ministry of Finance officials acknowledge that this is a flaw in the legislation. But they have told transfer partners, such as Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education, that even though they admit it's flawed, it's too late to make any adjustments.

I say to you, Treasurer, you and I know it's not true. It is not too late. We have tabled an amendment that specifically will deal with that, and I would ask you directly, will you support that amendment?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Just to put things in perspective, given the preamble of the leader of the third party, the government House leader did offer an extra day of hearings in committee of the whole, and no agreement could be arrived at with the two opposition parties. Secondly, you're quite right that the time allocation motion was tabled on Wednesday afternoon, and despite the tabling of that motion, it didn't seem to bring any particular discipline to the debate, because the opposition continued to ramble on in a very general way between sections 1 and 4 and all aspects of the bill. So I think it's unfair to say that we unduly or prematurely



served notice of time allocation. There was an opportunity on the part of the opposition to have a more fulsome debate in committee, and no agreement could be arrived at between the opposition parties and the government.

**Mr Harris:** Once again, that's not correct at all. What we were offered was this: We were offered two days in committee of the whole and not one word on third reading, or one day in committee of the whole and one day on third reading. That's what we were offered, and quite frankly, that's not acceptable to us. That is not acceptable to us.

1410

We've heard the rhetoric. Less than an hour into amendments on a flawed bill, that you admit is flawed, that your officials admit is flawed, that we all know is flawed, is not providing a proper opportunity for the amendments. You've done nothing to send any kind of signal that you intend to support, or support even parts of, any of our very substantive amendments, and I tell you this: Your move to close off debate so quickly, quite frankly, is a slap in the face to all the other groups out there that have proposed amendments, that have talked about flaws in the legislation.

We want to ensure that the legislation is able to pass. We want to ensure, though, that the legislation that passes will not hamstring successive governments. We want to ensure that it will be fair, and we want to ensure that it will be fair to all groups as to the size and scope of reductions. So I ask you this: Will you talk to the House leader about giving ample time or enough time or reasonable time to make sure we get debate on all of the substantive amendments?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I find it amazing, passing strange even, that the leader of the third party, who only about three weeks ago was saying, "Bring in the bill; bang, bang, bang, and we'll get this legislation through"—that's what he was saying—now suddenly wants a more fulsome debate.

I believe as well that the official opposition at one point said, "Bring in the bill; we'll deal with it today." That's what they said. I'm telling you, Mr Speaker, we are truly getting some wonky messages from across the floor.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Minister, when I asked you several weeks ago about the possible increased criminal activity as a result of locating a casino in Windsor, Ontario, and relayed to you the statistics with respect to increase in crime in Atlantic City, you said, "It is probably not reasonable to compare Atlantic City with Windsor." Minister, have you ever been to Atlantic City?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** No, I have not been to

Atlantic City. I am aware of the 12 casinos that exist in Atlantic City in a very small population of, I think, 35,000.

**Mr Eves:** That answer explains a lot of things to me about the proposed casino project in Windsor, because I can assure you, Minister, if you had ever been to Atlantic City, nobody would wish that on the citizens of Windsor.

I would like to quote you from the president of the Atlantic City Merchants Association: "The right way to do it is to revitalize the downtown first, that way you already have something that can induce people to come out of the casinos."

Could you tell me what steps your government has taken to totally revitalize downtown Windsor before the casino goes into operation?

**Hon Ms Churley:** I think the member is missing the point here. Let me explain again to him that in fact the casino that will be built in Windsor is exactly the opposite concept from the 12 casinos that were built in Atlantic City, without any consultation with the downtown. Those casinos are designed to bring people in and keep them in there. The Windsor casino is designed in such a way, with a small complement of stores and restaurants, so that visitors to Windsor will be able, and will in fact be encouraged, to go out into the downtown of Windsor and enjoy the stores and the restaurants and the entertainment centres in the downtown.

**Mr Eves:** Again, in the minister's answer, I think she has unwittingly put her thumb right on the problem. The problem is exactly what you just said. People are going to come by bus from Detroit to Windsor, go into the casino, gamble and leave again. That is going to do absolutely nothing for the downtown core in the city of Windsor.

Thomas Carver, president of the Casino Association of New Jersey, is quoted as saying that "the huge expectations for downtown growth have often failed in cities ambitious for casino-initiated change.

"It's human greed and public greed basically. The real problem is that the government gets so greedy and wants so much. I see this repeated over and over again."

Can you not see that's exactly what your government is doing with the Windsor casino project? You haven't taken any steps to revitalize downtown. You're not doing anything to keep the public in Windsor. You're going to transport them by bus over the bridge or under the tunnel. They're going to get back on their bus and go home a lot poorer, and you have accomplished nothing except bringing all the bad points that casinos bring to the city of Windsor. Can you not see that?

**Hon Ms Churley:** I believe the member is not hearing what I'm saying. I said exactly the opposite of what he said. When we decided to build a pilot project in Windsor, we consulted very closely with the city

council and with the downtown business people of Windsor, and studied how casinos were built in other locations and the kinds of planning processes that took place. Let me repeat again that the problem with the casinos in places like Atlantic City is that they built up to 12 casinos, huge casinos, in a very, very small town. The object in mind is to bring those people into those casinos and keep them in there. What we're doing in Windsor is the exact opposite of that.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources, but he appears to be AWOL. He was on the list here to be here today, so I guess I'll have to ask the question to the Premier.

I was reading the weekend paper and I was surprised to hear this, but I just want to get the Premier's comment on this. It says: "An NDP cabinet minister said Friday he's not sure whether he or the Ontario government caucus will support Premier Bob Rae's controversial wage freeze legislation. Natural Resources minister Howard Hampton admitted his discomfort with the bill, which would chop \$2 billion from the government's \$43-billion public sector payroll for each of three years." His quote that really has me interested is: "I've always been a team player, but nobody is comfortable with this bill. Many of us won't know what we'll do until the deadline arrives."

I presume the Premier talked to Mr Hampton on the weekend. Could the Premier tell us whether Mr Hampton will be joining the member for Perth and the member for Peterborough in opposing this bill?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I haven't had a chance to speak to the Minister of Natural Resources, but I'd be very surprised if he wasn't supporting the legislation.

**Mr Bradley:** In light of the fact that he has been publicly quoted and one would anticipate that he is not—

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** Read the rest of the story.

**Mr Bradley:** If the Speaker would let me, I would do as Mr Wildman has asked me and read the rest of the story, but you won't let me do that. When he says, "Many of us won't know what we'll do until the deadline arrives," now that the Premier is apparently losing the support of the Conservative Party, which is going to change its mind and vote against this bill on third reading, is the Premier contemplating withdrawing the bill rather than losing it on a vote in this House?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Actually not.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** My question is to the Premier. The Premier may be aware that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has indicated that

Canada could move quickly to remove sanctions against South Africa. It has been the policy of Ontario to support this federal position. I was wondering, Mr Premier, could you tell us today what Ontario's current position on sanctions against South Africa is?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I appreciate the question from the honourable member. There's been, I think, a consistent development of policy over the years, which is that we have essentially worked with the federal government, and not only with the government of Canada, but under the leadership of the federal government in this area, with a number of other Commonwealth countries. Any change of our policy with respect to expanded trade or commercial or financial relationships would obviously depend on a signal from Ottawa and other Commonwealth countries with respect to changes. Having said that, let me also say that I look forward to a supplementary question and a chance to respond further.

1420

**Mr Carr:** I understand from that answer that the position is the same. I will say that a cabinet submission in 1992 states, "Ontario endorses a ban on the purchase of supplies, equipment and services originating in South Africa." That's why we find it curious, Mr Premier, that officials in your government, officials from the Ontario casino project, would meet with the Sun Corp of South Africa, operators of the notorious Sun City entertainment complex, regarding the casino project in Windsor.

My question to the Premier is this: Can you tell me if the government endorses this ban on South African services, and if not, why did officials from the Ontario casino project meet with the people from the Sun Corp of South Africa? Can you explain that, please?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I wasn't aware of any commercial dealings with any particular corporation. I'm not aware whether there were conversations or there weren't. All I can tell the honourable member is that the government's position with respect to commercial contracts and with respect to commercial dealings very much remains in place.

#### WATER SUPPLY

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** My question is for the Minister of Environment and Energy. The village of Bloomfield has been trying for many years to improve both the quantity and quality of its water supply. The village has secured all the necessary agreements. However, Bloomfield was passed over for funding under the Jobs Ontario Capital program earlier this spring. They have the engineering design done for their project, which will bring Bay of Quinte water from Picton, and they are ready to begin construction as soon as funding approval is received from the ministry.

Can the minister give me some idea of when this



funding will be available to the village so they can begin construction? The residents of Bloomfield too want to know when they will have a reliable source of good, clean drinking water.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** The member will know, as all members of the House are aware, that there is legislation before the House on the formation of a number of crown agencies, one of which is the Ontario Clean Water Agency, which will have responsibility for these matters once legislation is passed.

The current schedule, as I understand it, is that the Ontario Clean Water Agency will be mailing out application forms this month. We expect the municipalities to return them by early fall, in September, and then beginning in October, the clean water agency will be evaluating and making decisions with regard to its capital plans for the next year, and new projects will be announced in January 1994. So Bloomfield, I hope, will be able to participate and perhaps will be one of the new projects in the fiscal year 1994.

#### WAGE PROTECTION

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Labour. You will recall that on June 23 I asked you a question about your decision to abolish the employment standards program committee, a committee that was working to collect money for workers who were paid under minimum wage, or for companies that had gone out of business and neglected to pay their holiday pay, and was a very worthwhile, successful collection committee on behalf of the people of Ontario. In fact, you'll recall that in the three months leading up to March 31, the committee had collected some \$901,000 on behalf of those disadvantaged workers.

You said at the time that the collections function will be turned over to the field officers, and that the field officers will do a much better job. That was your answer.

I have here a memo from one of your staff, Minister.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** A secret memo?

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, it sort of came under my door in a brown envelope. The gentleman who sent the memo is an employment standards officer and a steward of OPSEU Local 585. He states in this memo:

"It is unfortunate that the minister was seemingly misinformed and led to make statements and decisions which are embarrassing to us all. The committee has been discussing the future of the collections function with no clear terms of reference nor idea of its mandate," and he goes on with a number of other rather startling statements that they have not made a decision, and you have just unilaterally come out and told them that they're out of business.

Minister, what kind of labour relations is this for a Minister of Labour of this government to be shoving down the throat of their own employees?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** I think first I should add a point that I failed to mention when we had this question before us a week ago, and that's that at least seven of the eight people who have been laid off from the agency to collect the money that's there are now working with the Finance ministry. So they have had other jobs; they haven't lost their jobs.

I can also tell him that the intent is very, very clear; very, very clear that the employment standards officers are in the field, that part of their responsibility was to take a look at this, and they will be doing the collecting. As I mentioned before, we have some 50 or 60 additional employment standards officers in the field.

The three people who lay out the cases where we may have to go to court are still with the ministry and are still responsible for making sure that we've made the arguments necessary to collect the money, and we think it will be a more efficient operation.

**Mr Mahoney:** Just very briefly, let me read you a quote from Hansard, and then we'll play a little game and you can say, "Who said that?" It says here: "What you've done here is you've eliminated an agency that actually makes money. On top of that, out of the seven full-time permanent positions, you've moved six of them into the Ministry of Finance."

**Mr Bradley:** Who said that?

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, I think it was me, actually. You may have neglected to inform the House, sir, because I had to tell you that that's in fact what you had done. You missed the point of my question. You have a steward of OPSEU, Local 585, saying here that the ESPC, the committee, is having discussions on the future of this function, and that they are still pending; that's one scenario. The other one: He says, "Or someone forget to tell the ESPC that it is simply spinning its wheels in the mud."

Minister, you've made a decision unilaterally. Either you forgot to tell the members of this committee, this very successful collection agency, or your staff forgot to tell you. I don't know what's going on. I didn't make this up. This is a memo from your own people saying they're embarrassed at your answer.

My question, very simply: As the Minister of Labour, what kind of message does this send to your employees doing a good job successfully collecting funds on behalf of workers who have been shafted, one way or another, by the people they work for? You just shut the whole program down, even though it makes money, and then in a stroke of labour-management, said simply—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member conclude his question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** We're all unable to understand. You

don't even communicate with your employees. How can you truly represent yourself as the Minister of Labour with that kind of behaviour?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** We never said that they weren't doing a good job or hadn't improved the collections. What we did say very, very clearly was that we think we have a better and a more efficient way of doing it, with fewer people involved in the Ministry of Labour. That's part of our responsibility, to see that we get the most efficient operation in the ministry, and that's what we intend to do.

#### SENIORS' HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is to the Minister of Health. The Ontario drug benefit program announcement of last week confirmed that when it comes to health care and user fees, seniors should know that the NDP will say one thing in public and end up doing just the opposite behind closed cabinet doors.

During the last election, the NDP was critical of those of us who were honest in discussing the need to reform Ontario's health care system. When the Liberals brought in user fees in long-term care, and I checked Hansard, Bob Rae pounded his sanctimonious fist in this House. In fact, I say to you, Minister, you are in power today because your party ran around the province in 1990 telling people that David Peterson was a liar, and you falsely labelled the leader of the Ontario PC Party with respect to the issue of health care reform.

Minister, explain to this House why you decided to level user fees on to the backs of seniors when your party has repeatedly argued, both in opposition and in government, that user fees are ineffective and serve as a deterrent to accessible health care.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I would say to the member that there are a number of services related to the health care field which are not free and universal: For assistive devices, for example, the people who benefit pay some portion of the cost, as, as he has said, in long-term care and in nursing homes.

The Ontario drug benefit plan has been a plan that has been universal only to those over the age of 65 or to those on social assistance. The result has been that there have been two million people in this province who have no coverage for drug benefits because they're not employed by somebody who provides it.

1430

What we have done is to release a consultation paper in order to have a public debate about how we can in fact make the program fairer, and we believe making it fairer means extending the eligibility to everybody who needs drugs. In order to contain the cost, which I would say to the member has been rising at more than 16% per annum over the last several years, we believe it is appropriate to discuss sharing in that cost by everybody who benefits, and by that we mean the manufacturers

and the pharmacists as well as those who benefit from the program.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** When we say it, it's user fees. When you say it, it's sharing.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** That's a very interesting response, because in the last election, I recall the NDP going around saying that it would expand drug coverage to the working poor. What they didn't tell the seniors of this province is that they were going to take away their drug coverage. The minister and her colleagues from the New Democratic Party went around the province fear-mongering and saying that Progressive Conservatives were solely interested in dismantling the health care system, yet it is your government that continues to apply user fees in a clandestine and systematic fashion.

In August 1992, the former NDP Health minister, Frances Lankin, was quoted in the *Globe and Mail* as saying, "We will not be introducing user fees to help pay for the drug plan." Well, after last week's announcement, we know that this simply is not true.

It's all very well that you've recently released a discussion paper concerning the Ontario drug benefit plan, but the fact is, you've already made the key decisions. You've already decided that user fees will be introduced into that system, and many seniors simply won't be able to afford it. I ask you with respect to your discussion paper, what do you expect seniors to discuss when you've already made the essential decisions behind cabinet doors?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I take it from the member's question that his party opposes any kind of user fees and would in fact expand the Ontario drug benefit plan at no cost to any of the participants. I find that interesting in view of some of the comments that certainly the Prime Minister and others, who also belong to his party, have made.

I would point out to him that Ontario is the only province in the country that doesn't have some kind of cost-sharing mechanism for its drug benefit plan. We certainly wish that the finances of the province were such that we could expand the program to cover the working poor without at the same time looking at how we can contain the costs at the \$1.1 billion they now are.

What we have done in our consultation paper is talk about much more than merely the cost of the program, but how we can reform the program to make sure there is appropriate prescribing, not overprescribing, and appropriate use of other professionals in the system, namely the pharmacists, so that their counsel and information can be available to people. What is the objective is to make sure that everybody gets the appropriate medication and that nobody is denied it



because of the cost, and we have heard in this House much discussion about people who are unable to get any drug coverage because of the nature of their disease.

#### CONTAMINATED SOIL

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a question for the Minister of Environment and Energy. I've got five municipalities in my riding—it's rather a large riding for one being so close to Toronto—and I like to represent all the municipalities within my riding.

A proposal has come to one of the townships in my riding, Uxbridge, that they would put in a processing plant for petroleum-contaminated soils in a depleted gravel pit. On June 14, the town passed a resolution asking for an environmental assessment, and on June 15, a letter went to one of your offices at the central region on Overlea Boulevard asking for that environmental assessment. The people of my community want to know—as you can see, it's front-page news—whether you're going to have that environmental hearing that's necessary for the protection of the environment.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I hope my response will also be front-page news. The fact is that we've received a large number of concerns and complaints from interested groups and individuals and property owners regarding things like truck traffic, the proximity of a school, and the possibility of contamination of groundwater. We've also received the resolution from the township of Uxbridge requesting an environmental assessment hearing. Because of these concerns and the resolution passed by the township council, I agree that we should have an environmental assessment hearing and one will be held.

**Mr O'Connor:** I'm glad to hear that the minister has confirmed that, because not only is it front page news, but people like Steve Nuris are writing to newspapers, letters to the editor, saying that we have to make sure that spillage of contaminated soil that could occur as it's being transported through the town needs to be taken into consideration, increased volume of traffic, the safety of the Goodwood public school will be jeopardized, the groundwater could be affected. There are some questions they have, like, "Who's going to buy my property in the future if the water is contaminated?" and "How can we live where the water is contaminated?"

What I need to know, Minister, is will this provide the opportunity for my constituents to come forward with all their concerns? I only raised a few of the concerns, but as you can see by the length of this letter, which I'm not going to take up the time of the House with, they've got a lot of serious concerns they want to have raised because of the threat to the water quality. Will they have that opportunity to do that?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I really appreciate the interest of the member and his concern for his area and for his constituents. I want to assure him that all of the concerns that have been raised, both by him and by others

in the area, can be brought forward before the environmental assessment board for its hearing. The evidence will be evaluated and decisions will be made on the basis of that, particularly the concerns with regard to truck traffic, noise, the possibility of contamination of groundwater, particularly as it relates to the protection of the Oak Ridges moraine, which I'm sure all members of the House are determined must be protected. The environmental assessment hearing will make it possible for all of those concerns to be dealt with in a fulsome and proper manner.

#### DAY CARE

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Minister, you will be aware that your social contract legislation, Bill 48, has had a devastating impact on the 932 family day care spaces in the region of Peel. As a result of Bill 48, the family day care program will be eliminated this September 3. This action affects not only the providers of family day care spaces but also those who require the services, primarily the single moms who have made a go of it and have found jobs. The dilemma they face is that there are not sufficient day care spaces available in Peel to meet the 932 space needs. In September, they're going to have to leave their jobs.

I'm receiving a number of calls and letters. A constituent writes:

"I am a divorced mother with two small children. I am currently involved in the family home day care program. I've been involved in the program since October 1991 and it has enabled me to get off the mother's allowance program and be in the workforce to support myself and my children. The day care program allows us to go to work and to keep our skills up to date to stay in the current workforce. I myself will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to continue my job."

Minister, what do you say to this person and the many others who depend on that very important service?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I want to correct something in the member's question. I think at the outset he said that the social contract legislation had brought this event about. I want to be very clear that it is my understanding that in fact this decision has nothing to do with the social contract legislation; it has everything to do with the regional municipality of Peel's decision in this case, as part of its way of having to deal with the cost reduction, the cost constraint, to shut down this program. That's a decision they are making as a way of controlling their costs. It is not related to the legislation in any way whatsoever.

They have made a proposal to us which we are looking at, but I have to say that my inclination would be to indicate to the municipality that this is a program

we would want it to continue and that we hope it can find ways it can indeed continue this program. We certainly intend to continue providing our support in terms of the 80% of the funding that we provide to the municipality for it to maintain this program.

**Mr Offer:** Minister, when you say that this is not a result of your social contract legislation, with respect, I think you're absolutely wrong. This is what has been put on the region of Peel as a result of Bill 48, your social contract legislation.

1440

You shake your head, but I would like you to respond to this. The region of Peel has provided an option as to how it can continue this particular program. They requested a meeting with you and your staff last week, which was cancelled. They requested a meeting with you and your staff today, which was not forthcoming. They are requesting a meeting with you and your staff to decide and determine how this very essential program can be continued. To date, you have not met with them and you have cancelled appointments. I think it's somewhat irresponsible for you to stand up today and to say how much you care.

If you really care, commit today to meet with the officials of the region of Peel with a view to saving this essential service so that people who have found jobs can in fact maintain those jobs this September 3.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I certainly expect to be meeting with representatives of the municipality or at least to be speaking with the regional chair by telephone, because I know we've had some problems in trying to schedule a meeting.

But let me be equally clear that as to the proposal they are putting before us, I would have great difficulty recommending to my cabinet colleagues that we accept it, because the proposal that is being recommended is for us in effect to credit back to the municipality a portion of the dollars it believes we are going to be saving if it cuts this program.

Well, the bottom line is, we don't want them to cut this program. We're not interested in not spending the 80% of the dollars that we spend in providing this program. We want to continue providing the program, and we want the municipality to continue providing it. The answer is not in us looking at a roundabout way to cut their target of the expenditure reductions. The issue is for them to look at other ways in which to make those savings.

#### DRIVERS' LICENCES

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** New question? The member for Etobicoke—the member for York Mills.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** Almost got you that time, Mr Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Transportation. If

you can cast your mind back two months ago, Minister, before you went off on your expensive junket to Spain, you announced with much fanfare the introduction of graduated licences. At the time you introduced it, I asked you why you didn't come forward with legislation for at least first and second reading before we rose for the summer. Are you going to come forward with that legislation?

#### **Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):**

First, on the comment which is only too facile, vis-à-vis what the member of the opposition said, and I'm trying to quote verbatim, about a "junket to Madrid, Spain," it wasn't. Let me set the record straight.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, will be hosting the next Olympiad of Transportation, the International Road Federation. It's held every four years. It will bring 3,500 full-fledged delegates to the city of Toronto, and they will spend more than \$7 million. So \$7 million vis-à-vis \$2,000 to go and get the flame, go and get the torch and bring it to Toronto, is good value for money.

The question itself: A graduated driver's licence was introduced by this administration with the help of all three parties concerned. What it says is that you have an obligation, an increased obligation, not a reverse onus, with due respect; the component of mobility, the thin line between a right and a privilege to access the roads of Ontario. We're not going to make it tougher, but we're going to make it more onerous in terms of its obligation.

If you wouldn't stall the legislation at every opportunity, the graduated driver's licence would be the order of the day today, not in the fall session like we intend to introduce it.

**Mr Turnbull:** In his inimitable way, the minister has once again failed to answer the very simple question.

The fact is that when the minister came forward announcing this, concurrent with a lot of very unpopular announcements they were making, we recognized that this was a smokescreen. This is what in the navy in the Second World War they used to call "making smoke"; in other words, you blow a lot of smoke to put people off the other issues of the day.

Minister, you have just admitted in your answer that there is broad acceptance and support from both the Liberals and the Conservatives for this legislation. The Insurance Bureau of Canada, at the time of your announcement, said it was supportive of this legislation, but what they are saying to us specifically is that they are not supportive of you going out to committee without seeing the draft legislation so that people are speaking to the specifics, not some smoke that you're blowing out at us.

My question is, why don't you bring forward the legislation now? In October 1992, your ministry said



that they had almost finished drafting the legislation—

**The Speaker:** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Turnbull:** You have support; why don't you bring forward the legislation today?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** As a normal course of events, we readily acquiesce that before we go to committee, and it's only commonsensical, that all parties that have requested that the draft be put forth—so not only in intent and spirit, not only in terms of the compendium, but that the very words that are in the draft be examined, be scrutinized meticulously, so that people afford themselves a better opportunity to come up with amendments that will make the legislation better.

Simply put and by way of conclusion, the draft will appear in short order; then we will go to committee for consultation; amendments will no doubt be introduced; then we will table legislation; then finally all Ontarians will benefit from that legislation.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Finance.

OPSEU has identified several billions in cost savings which could do away with the need for payroll reductions and still allow budget targets to be met. In return for cooperating in achieving these reductions, they're asking for collective agreements to be respected until their expiry. After these agreements expire, they're prepared to cooperate in cost reductions in return for a no-layoff clause and protection of the level of public services. Yet government negotiators are saying they aren't prepared to listen to OPSEU unless they throw existing collective agreements into the open.

Why is it that this government is unwilling to respond directly to these positive cost-cutting proposals, and why is it that the New Democratic government refuses to listen to the positive solutions brought forward in good faith by the leadership of OPSEU on this critical issue?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** This government, for a couple of months now, has been doing a great deal of listening to OPSEU and to other people in the public sector about how to effect savings, and we take those suggestions seriously. There are, however, some projections of cost-savings that simply don't add up. Also, there are some projected cost savings that would take a long time to be realized and we simply have to achieve the savings that we've targeted for the social contract for this fiscal year and the two subsequent fiscal years.

While I don't for a minute dismiss the positive suggestions being brought forth by OPSEU—as a matter of fact, I appreciate very much their suggestions—at the same time, we've got to get on with the task of achieving \$2 billion in savings in public sector compensation.

That doesn't mean that we rule out those other savings in efficiency and costs by any stretch of the imagination. We take them very, very seriously.

**Mr Drainville:** Does not the Minister of Finance understand that there is a contradictory message being sent out here, and that is, on one hand, the Premier has tried to have us believe that he's encouraging the public sector unions to work together with the government in a spirit of cooperation and, on the other, when they find solutions, those solutions aren't being taken seriously.

In good faith, the leadership of OPSEU has indicated a willingness to pursue more open discussions with you because it has been increasingly concerned about the variance between what you seem to be saying and what the Premier seems to be saying and what is communicated to the negotiators. Quite frankly, there are many who are wondering whether you're truly bargaining in good faith.

Why is it that there is a variation between what the Premier says in meetings with Mr Upshaw and what your negotiators say once the Premier has left the room?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** That is simply nonsense. This government has taken them very seriously. But I'll tell you, when someone comes forward with a suggestion that there is \$700 million in savings in OHIP card fraud, then you can't take that particular suggestion seriously because it is totally out of line, and anybody who thinks that there's that level of savings simply isn't dealing with reality. We know that there is an element of fraud, but it's not a fraction of \$700 million.

1450

We have worked extremely hard with OPSEU to achieve savings, and I would remind not just the member who asked the question but everyone else as well that when we went through the expenditure reduction exercise this spring, the largest single reduction was in the government's own operations, to the tune of over \$700 million in savings in this fiscal year alone. So anyone who says that we're not achieving savings within our own ministry simply hasn't been following the efforts that we've been making. I think most fairminded people understand that.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Smoke and mirrors, like your \$17 billion estimates. It was all smoke and mirrors, Floyd.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Unlike the Liberals when they were in office, we have finally got a hold on our expenditures; and for the former Minister of Health to be complaining, who ran up health care expenditures at an average increase of 11% a year and drug benefit increases of 18% a year, is to laugh at how serious she really is.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired. Motions?

ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT MEMBER

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The normal rotation in this place during question period is to allow each party to ask questions in order. The member who just asked the question sits—

**Hon Floyd Laughtren (Minister of Finance):** Eighteen per cent a year, Elinor. You call that responsible management?

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Never enough for you.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the members for Oriole and Nickel Belt please come to order so that I can hear the point of order.

**Mr Mahoney:** The member for Victoria-Haliburton has asked a question and jumped into the rotation, which then took a great deal of time of course for the Treasurer to give a non-answer to. But my point of order is that the rotation, without any agreement on non-aligned members having been arrived at in this place—and you know yourself, sir, those discussions are currently going on as to what role a non-aligned member might play in this place and on committees. None of that has been resolved, and in my view we've been shortchanged an opportunity to ask another question by the official opposition because this member was recognized in his non-aligned format, out of the proper rotation.

**The Speaker:** First of all, the member for Mississauga West is absolutely correct: He has a point of order. Indeed, I recognized the independent member for Victoria-Haliburton. If at that point, some member had risen on a point of order, of course the member would not have been allowed to ask the question unless by unanimous consent. I recognize the difficulty both in the strictness of the rotation, as spelled out in the orders, but also we have three independent members, none of whom under the current rules has an opportunity to ask a question in the House.

On the last point, the member will know that, had the member for Victoria-Haliburton not been recognized, a member from the government side would've been recognized, thus utilizing the last amount of time, not penalizing this side at all.

The House, obviously through the committee, will have to come to terms with the responsibilities and opportunities for independent members, and this House will at some point have to decide whether or not those who are independent will indeed have an opportunity to ask questions in the House.

**Mr Mahoney:** Mr Speaker, on the same point: If I understand you correctly, you unilaterally made the decision to recognize the non-aligned member to ask a question and you're suggesting that I or someone else should have risen at that time to raise a point of order and you would've then bypassed that member and gone back into the normal rotation. Is that, sir, what I under-

stand you to have just said? I need to understand it.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Mississauga West, I think I was quite clear in my explanation. What I am saying to the House is that at some point the House needs to come to terms with the roles, responsibilities and opportunities for independent members. Indeed, at any time any member may be recognized—perhaps the member would take his seat—by way of unanimous consent, as members on occasion have asked and in fact granted opportunities for members outside of question period to ask a question by unanimous consent in the House.

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think there is a certain sense of unfairness to you in this capacity as Speaker, because I think perhaps the House needs to know that the three House leaders have met in a meeting and discussed this issue and there was some agreement between the House leaders—I'm sure those House leaders who are here will jump up and correct me if I'm wrong—that there will be times when, according to the discretion of the Speaker, like in the House of Commons in Ottawa, an independent member can be allowed to ask a question.

That was agreed upon by the three House leaders. This is the first question, in all these many weeks, that has been attempted by an independent member, the first question to be recognized in this particular way.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Your first day.

**Mr Drainville:** I'm afraid you don't know what you're talking about, sir.

I'd like to say that the point at issue here is a very serious one because what is happening here, and what this House has to consider, is the reality that there are independent members in this House and that those independent members have said very straightly that they deserve to have the same rights as other members in this House. The government House leader and the other House leaders have met to discuss this. It has been put in front of the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly.

I might add that the reality is that we as independent members, and certainly I as an independent member, have not been pushing this House. I have not been getting up and refusing unanimous consent to the honourable House leader, which I have every right to do and which I will do unless these changes are made, Mr Speaker. I would ask at least that there be some reasonable consideration of the rights of members in this House.

**The Speaker:** The member has made his point.

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: The member made a comment that causes me some concern. Although I



don't want to speak specifically to the incident in question, there is a basic question that I would like to ask. Mr Speaker, without trying to speak exactly what you said but to paraphrase, you stated that had someone arisen when the member stood up you would have ruled the member out of order and would have continued in a rotation.

The concern that I have is that it is my understanding that the role of the Speaker is to maintain order in the House. It causes me some concern to say that that order could only have been maintained if a member brings it to the attention of the Speaker. It would seem to me to be the Speaker's role to make that decision, without another member standing up and bringing it to your attention, that the speaker in question was not following the rules of the House and was in fact out of order. That was a decision for the Speaker to make and was not dependent on a member's standing and bringing it to the Speaker's attention.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Mr Speaker, I hadn't intended to rise on this point, but I find myself compelled to rise, to pick up on the point that the member for Victoria-Haliburton has raised around this point of order.

The three House leaders, as you are aware, sir, did meet with you and discussed this matter at some length about, I believe, six weeks ago. It was agreed that the Legislative Assembly committee should deal with the matter of non-aligned or, as the member for Victoria-Haliburton refers to them, independent members, in all respects, in terms of the House and in terms of committees and so on and so forth. The committee, as I understand it, is now doing that.

You, sir, put to us that if we had no objection, you would, in your discretion, consider both questions and statements, private members' statements, from the three non-aligned members. We responded, sir, that we had no objection to that so long as you ensured that no non-aligned member at any point got greater service through that process than the average member in this House.

Members, before they go dealing with points of order and questions to the Chair, should understand that and understand that fully, that the three House leaders in fact agreed, on an informal basis, to allow that to happen while the matter was being discussed in committee.

**The Speaker:** I trust that in part that may answer the question posed by the honourable member for Wilson Heights. I may say to him that in a sense he is absolutely right. The House has a very difficult task of coming to terms with a set of rules designed on the basis of parties. The rules do not recognize independent members. At the same time, members are here to represent their constituents.

I was attempting to test the House in a sense and I

know that the committee is seized with this matter and will work on it diligently and, hopefully, an agreeable answer will be found. I appreciate the matter raised by the member for Wilson Heights.

1500

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I have a point of order under section 98 of the standing orders. On June 16, I had placed before the House an order paper question of the Minister of Health. I received response number 223 on June 30. The order paper question which I placed was with respect to physician resources, planning, cost benefit analyses and other materials. What I received, however, in the response package was a package of the minister's itinerary and briefing notes for a trip to northern Ontario, to Timmins, Cochrane and other northern areas.

While there may not have been an intentional breach of the standing orders here and that material will certainly be useful to me, I am asking that the Minister of Health provide me with the appropriate response which was indicated in the index to the answer which I received.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** It sounds like there was a mistake. I don't know if the member for Halton Centre was looking forward to joining the minister on the trip north or not, but perhaps that matter now has been addressed in the House and the Minister of Health will be able to respond.

#### PETITIONS

##### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a petition from a number of people in the Niagara Peninsula who are concerned about the Retail Business Holidays Act. It reads as follows:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

I affix my signature to this petition and have voted in the House against Sunday shopping.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition re the amendment to the Retail Business Holidays Act, proposed wide-open Sunday shopping and elimination of Sunday as a legal holiday.

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition to wide-open Sunday business.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on retailers, retail employees and their families.

"The proposed amendment to the Retail Business Holidays Act, Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of legal holiday and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

There are 160 signatures from Orillia, Severn Bridge, Barrie, Midland, Hawkestone, Warminster, Waubashene, Oro township and Orillia township, and I have signed my name to it.

#### SCARBOROUGH BLUFFS CONSERVATION

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** I have a petition signed by about 180 constituents who put in a lot of hard work over this nice weekend.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas it is in the interest of all people of Ontario and all of our future generations to preserve the beauty of the Scarborough Bluffs; and

"Whereas the province of Ontario, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority commenced the construction of breakwall and roadway to stabilize the bluffs and create a waterfront trail; and

"Whereas erosion continues at an alarming rate in areas where the breakwall is incomplete thus threatening the safety of homes near the bluff edge; and

"Whereas some homes have already been expropriated due to erosion at great public cost;

"We, the undersigned, call upon the Minister of Natural Resources to make the securing of the bluffs an immediate priority and to enable the Metro Toronto Conservation Authority to proceed with the necessary construction to complete the lakefront breakwall and roadway between Rogate Place and the Bellamy ravine."

I'm pleased to affix my signature to this.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I have a petition which reads as follows:

"As patients, we are concerned about the proposed NDP government decrease in radiology technical fees for general radiology, ultrasound and nuclear medicine examinations. These cuts will have a severe impact on health care services. It will result in waiting lists, layoff of staff and limiting access to newer and continually improving diagnostic technologies. These services are necessary to ensure that Ontarians receive high-quality health care that is delivered effectively and efficiently."

The petition is signed by people from Bramalea,

Toronto, Oshawa and Burlington. I have affixed my signature to it.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition that's addressed to the members of provincial Parliament re the amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act, proposed wide-open Sunday shopping and elimination of Sunday as a legal holiday.

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

That's signed by a number of good people from the Collingwood area and throughout my riding of Simcoe West. I too have affixed my name to it.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** On behalf of the member for Brantford, I have a petition to present.

"To the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"That free and open collective bargaining for public service employees be restored and be returned to its honourable position in Ontario;

"That the social contract in its present form be destroyed and that the valuable programs and services in the public sector be maintained for the betterment of all Ontarians;

"That the government withdraw Bill 48 and in place of this bill the government work cooperatively with the public service unions to find an equitable solution rather than eliminating valuable public services."

I affix my name to this.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across this province;



"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"The government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the Ontario Medical Association-government framework and economic agreement."

It's signed by 183 constituents of my riding, and I add my signature in support of the petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Christian is called to love of neighbour, which includes a concern for the general wellbeing of society; and

"Whereas there's a direct link between the higher availability of legalized gambling and the incidence of addictive gambling (Macdonald and Macdonald, Pathological Gambling: The Problem, Treatment and Outcome, Canadian Foundation on Compulsive Gambling); and

"Whereas the damage of addiction to gambling in individuals is compounded by the damage done to families, both emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas the gambling market is already saturated with various kinds of government-operated lotteries; and

"Whereas the large-scale gambling activities invariably attract criminal activity; and

"Whereas the citizens of Detroit have since 1976 on three occasions voted down the introduction of casinos in that city, each time with a larger majority than the time before;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

This is signed by 84 members of my constituency, to which I, too, affix my signature.

1510

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** On behalf of the member for Frontenac-Addington, I have a petition to the members of provincial Parliament regarding the amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act, proposed wide-open Sunday shopping and elimination of Sunday as a legal holiday. It reads as follows:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the

fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

It's signed by 142 constituents, and in keeping with procedures of presenting petitions in this House, I affix my signature.

#### GO BUS SERVICE

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We oppose the provincial government's cancellation of GO bus route number 6565 (Newmarket, King, Maple, Yorkdale). To many of us, this is the only means of transportation. To the elderly, possibly the only means."

I have affixed my signature thereto.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 109 signatures from my riding of Dufferin-Peel. It's with respect to an amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act, proposed wide-open Sunday shopping:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to the proposed amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for quality of life, religious freedom and family time. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

I have signed this petition.

#### CHILD CARE CENTRES

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** I have a petition on behalf of over 1,000 constituents from the riding of Scarborough Centre, as well as constituents from the riding of Downsview:

"We, the undersigned, support the Student Centre Child Care in their attempts to be exempted from the payment of property tax. The government's attempts to extract excessive taxes from non-profit child care centres is yet another example of the lack of governmental support of education in our province and we protest this most strongly.

"Should a child care centre face annual payments of property taxes, the continued success of the centre will be severely in jeopardy and the university students, staff and faculty who use the centre will face higher fees and

possible closure of the centre.”

I affix my signature in support.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition here from many people from Cobourg, Port Hope, Campbellford, Hastings and Warkworth. It's a petition to the members of the provincial Parliament re the amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act, proposed wide-open Sunday shopping and elimination of Sunday as a legal holiday:

“I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of legal holiday in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

“I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

“The amendment included in Bill 38 dated, June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of ‘legal holiday’ and reclassify them as working days should be defeated.”

I have signed the petition.

#### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** A great number of constituents from my riding of Oakville South and the surrounding area have asked me to table a petition which reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas psychiatric hospitals’ expertise should be utilized as the nucleus to coordinate mental health services delivery; and

“Whereas it is unconscionable that the largest cuts in the mental health budget be extracted from the psychiatric hospitals; and

“Whereas 11,000 people in psychiatric facilities and in the community will suffer without adequate care,

“We, the undersigned, demand that the government not reduce the funding to provincial psychiatric hospitals.”

#### HEALTH CARE

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas proposals made under the government’s expenditure control plan and the social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

“Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across the province,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assem-

bly of Ontario as follows:

“That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario’s health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association-government framework and economic agreement.”

This is signed by about 121 residents of the Peterborough area.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** A petition to the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

“Whereas the people of Ontario are undergoing economic hardship, high unemployment and are faced with the prospect of imminent tax increases; and

“Whereas the Ontario motorist protection plan currently delivers cost-effective insurance benefits to Ontario drivers; and

“Since the passing of Bill 164 into law will result in higher automobile insurance premiums for Ontario drivers,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That Bill 164 be withdrawn.”

I have signed this petition, and it contains several thousand signatures.

#### TRUCKING INDUSTRY

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It reads:

“Whereas currently in Ontario the maximum length of a tractor pulling two trailers,” that being a double trailer combination or truck train, “is 23 metres, and the four western provinces, Quebec and the entire US interstate system have adopted a 25-metre overall length standard, posing a trade barrier to Ontarians; and

“Whereas adoption of a 25-metre overall tractor-trailer combination length would enhance highway safety by encouraging the increased utilization of the safest and most stable double trailer combinations; and

“Whereas the extension will also accommodate the use of 9.1- to 9.8-metre trailers and lead to a 10% increase in cubic capacity, with a resulting saving in transportation costs and a reduction in congestion as fewer power units would be required to remove the same amount of freight; and

“Whereas longer trucks consume less fuel on a tonne/mile basis than conventional units and also produce fewer pollutants; and

“Whereas an increase in the maximum semitrailer length from 14.68 metres,” 48-foot trailers, “to 16.2 metres,” 53-foot trailers, “would play a significant role in enhancing the competitiveness and the revitalization of the Ontario economy without compromising highway



safety because the productivity gains that the 400 cubic feet of additional cargo space available through the use of these trailers will offer will contribute to significant transportation cost savings; and

"Whereas these more productive trailers, by requiring fewer trucks to haul the same amount of freight, will also contribute to reduced congestion and lower fuel emissions, and evidence from the jurisdiction where these 53-foot trailers are used suggests that they have an impeccable safety record; and

"Whereas longer truck lengths will stimulate productivity in the transportation sector, reduce transportation costs to Ontario manufacturers, retailers and shippers and enhance the overall competitiveness of the Ontario economy with estimated annual transportation cost savings to Ontario businesses being \$100 million, which will help keep jobs in Ontario; and

"Whereas an inefficient gap in the Canadian transportation system exists because Ontario has just joined the western provinces and Quebec in adopting longer equipment standards, and this significant interprovincial trade barrier should be dismantled;

"We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to pass a bill to increase the overall tractor-trailer combination length from the current maximum of 23 metres to 25 metres, and to increase the maximum semitrailer length from 14.68 metres," 48-foot trailers, "to 16.2 metres," 53-foot trailers, "as recommended by the RTAC, Road and Transportation Association of Canada, study on uniform truck configuration."

This is signed by 38 people from the trucking industry, and I too attach my signature to it.

1520

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

On motion by Mr Lessard, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 58, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act and the Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowances Act / Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Assemblée législative et la Loi sur les allocations de retraite des députés à l'Assemblée législative.

**Mr Wayne Lessard (Windsor-Walkerville):** This bill would amend the Legislative Assembly Act by eliminating severance allowances for members who resign unless there's a serious medical reason for the resignation. It would also amend the Legislative Assembly Retirement Allowances Act by providing that members who retire on or after the day on which the bill becomes law would not be entitled to be paid their

pensions until the earlier of the day on which they reach the age of 55 or the day on which their age and years of service total 70.

If a member dies before attaining the age of 55 or before becoming eligible under the 70-year rule and leaves a surviving spouse, the spouse would not be entitled to be paid the retirement allowance until the day on which the member would have attained the age of 55 had he or she lived. However, if such a member leaves a surviving child or children but no spouse, the children would still be entitled to an immediate survivor benefit.

The bill also suspends pensions while a person is receiving compensation for acting as a member or officer of any government agency, commission, board, committee, office or organization.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### TIME ALLOCATION

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Orders of the day, Government House Leader.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Government notice of motion number 8.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I understand that under standing order 46, 46(c) in fact, this motion can be moved. But it seems to me that under the auspices of your chair, you should have the prerogative of undertaking an examination of whether or not this particular legislation has had any ample time whatsoever for debate.

I understand you are not in a position to anticipate whether this motion will pass, although, if we cast our eyes around the room and see how many government members there are and how many opposition members there are, it would seem to me that probably this motion will succeed late in the day, as is required.

However, Mr Speaker, that will mean we have had nowhere near the three days of second reading debate usually required as a minimum before a time allocation motion has been passed. We had but one day in committee of the whole and we had, as you understand very well, no time whatsoever in a standing committee to discuss this or to take public deputations.

I raise this because this seems to be, in my opinion anyway, an indication of an exceptional circumstance in which the role of the Speaker as the arbiter of matters which come to offend the rights of the minority—must sit and make a decision in favour of that minority's right to carry on the debate on bills like Bill 48.

This really, as a result of all the time that has elapsed—which is very little—on Bill 48, means that there has been an exceptional move here to bring closure at a time when we have had far less than three full days of debate on this particular matter. I would ask you, Mr Speaker, just to turn your mind to the question of whether in fairness you can allow this particular motion to be moved.

Even though it stands within the ambit of all the words we find under 46(c), I do believe that the riders that talk about a minimum of three days' debate on second reading and the need for fairness for discussion of what is a very major public issue ought to be brought to your attention and you ought to intervene at this time to protect the rights of the minority.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Bruce, I understand full well his point and understand the importance of the legislation. The member will know that under the standing rules, time allocation has been moved following second reading debate, and there is no provision in the orders that will assist the member for Bruce in accomplishing what he wishes to accomplish. I understand his concerns, but there isn't anything in the orders which would assist me in assisting the member for Bruce. The time allocation motion is in order and we should proceed.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On that point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the member for Bruce does have a valid point. If we would go back to when we negotiated these rule changes, I think you will find ample examples in Hansard. If there is a minimum of three days of debate on second reading, that was discussed. We also discussed putting time limits on how long a significant bill would be sent to committee, and I believe the time lines thrown around at that time were something like no less than two or three weeks of committee time on a bill of significance.

The then government House leader said no government in its right mind would dream of proceeding with a significant piece of legislation unless a bill went to committee during the break for at least two or three weeks. I guess we either have a retraction, a total reverse of position by the governing party, or we have a government that's out of its mind, in the words of the former NDP House leader of the day.

I would have thought the government at the very least would have sent Bill 48 out to committee for public hearings and input from the public. Seeing as how they're going to affect the wages of some almost one million public sector employees in the province of Ontario, I'd have thought they would have wanted to hear from those people at the very least, even if they didn't decide to change their legislation. I would have thought the bill would have been in committee where it could have received very proper clause-by-clause deliberation for a number of weeks when the House was not in session.

That not being the case, the bill now being in committee of the whole without ever having gone to committee to start with, I'd have thought the very least the government would have wanted to do was to let the time be spent on at least the 10 significant amendments it has itself and 10 our party has. Even at an hour an amendment, which I'm sure everybody would agree is

not a great deal of time if you split it among three political parties in the chamber, that would be a minimum of 20 hours of debate, and I don't think that's unreasonable at all.

Seeing how they've totally bypassed the three weeks the previous government House leader thought would be appropriate, seeing how they've totally bypassed public hearings, seeing how they've totally bypassed the committee stage, I'd have thought they might want to spend more than two or three days, in an afternoon of two and a half hours of length apiece, in committee of the whole if they were serious about entertaining any constructive amendments or suggestions to the legislation at all.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** It's interesting to listen to the comments from the two House leaders opposite this afternoon on Bill 48, and the tack they take in this debate. In a technical sense, the House leader of the official opposition is correct in terms of three sessional days. I remind you, though, that a normal sessional day amounts to two and a half hours of debating time, not eight and a half hours, and that Bill 48 on second reading was debated for the equivalent of about three weeks of House time on a normal basis. I think we need to take that into account when we understand the comments that are coming from the other side, I think in terms of trying to leave the public with the impression that the debate on this piece of legislation has been very contracted. Three full weeks of debate on second reading under normal circumstances is what we went through on this piece of legislation.

Mr Speaker, I can recall being in this House, as you will, when we, from both of the parties opposite, had to return to this House on an emergency basis to legislate workers back to work, emergency legislation which was passed at first, second and third reading within a week without any public hearings, without any deputations, without any extensive time spent on clause-by-clause. Well, here under this circumstance we didn't even try to sell this legislation as an emergency of that nature, and we have spent now several weeks on this legislation.

But when it went past the right of members opposite to refer it out to committee, the members opposite declined to do so, not that this government forced it past that stage, as would be implied by the House leader for the third party. Our standing orders, as you well know, clearly set out a right on the part of either of the opposition parties to refer this legislation out to a standing committee for hearings for clause-by-clause and the rest of the appropriate processes. The opposition parties declined to use those orders to accomplish that purpose because they understood the important nature of this legislation and because they understood the importance of getting legislation, which will impose certain penalties on people come August 1 without a negotiated settlement in some cases, passed and in place.



1530

I just have to say to you, Mr Speaker, that this motion is in order. It's a motion that's been carefully considered, based on what happened both in my discussions last week with the opposition House leaders and in terms of what happened here in the House last Wednesday afternoon, the first afternoon of clause-by-clause, when we spent the entire afternoon on four sections of the bill around which nobody has proposed any amendments and we wasted that entire time when we could have been dealing with either amendments from the official opposition, if it had moved them, or the amendments which the third party has brought forward, or perhaps even our own amendments to the bill.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Mr Speaker, I'd like to make a couple of comments before you make your ruling.

Firstly, we in the opposition parties did not send this out to committee. It's the ultimate irony, I would say to you, when we assisted the government in some fashion by not sending this specific bill out for committee, that we would have this thrown back in our faces as some reason why we should not be debating this or asking questions to a greater degree at committee of the whole and in fact see a time allocation of third reading. That argument I think is unreasonable and unfair to us in the opposition, considering we were trying to assist the government in putting this bill through as quickly as possible.

Secondly, we can talk about single pieces of legislation being brought through this House on an emergency basis, and that argument is very fair, except those pieces of legislation order people back to work. We're dealing with very specific groups, very specific unions, with very specific job responsibilities. May I suggest to you, Mr Speaker, this Bill 48 deals with nearly a million people. It's not ordering anyone back to work; it's taking money out of their pockets and in fact not paying them the wages they have collectively agreed to. To make the argument that this is similar to ordering people back to work in special emergency legislation again is a ridiculous argument, considering the scope and span of Bill 48, comparatively speaking, to ordering people back to work.

Thirdly, Mr Speaker, I want to note this. I've read the standing orders, and your comments to the member for Bruce, the House leader for the Liberals, are in fact correct. You can't point to any specific standing order that could assist the member for Bruce's arguments. But contrarily, you can't point to a standing order that says, "No, you can't in good conscience, hearing from opposition members and their concerns surrounding a bill and the very limited amount of time this bill has had for open, public discussions, not rule in their favour."

May I say, Mr Speaker, if your argument is simply,

"I can't find a standing order to assist you, nor can I find a standing order that says you're wrong," I think you're abrogating your responsibility as Speaker in assisting the minority people in this place to have proper airing of maybe one of the most important pieces of legislation this chamber has seen in this session and may well see over the five-year period.

Mr Speaker, I say this: Anyone who would suggest to you, and I speak directly about the government House leader, that Bill 48 is only worthy of three weeks of debate is, I think, not giving you fair information. Furthermore, the government House leader has the audacity in this place to suggest that there was a filibuster of some sort in committee of the whole and that nothing was being accomplished, when we all know full well, before an hour of committee of the whole, he had filed his motion for time allocation. Again, the three arguments he makes to you to defend his position are the most ridiculous, inane arguments, considering the fact the motion's been filed not 50 minutes into the debate in committee of the whole.

Mr Speaker, it is not only incumbent, it is also important on your basis to rule in favour of the member for Bruce's position, simply because it is the most important piece of legislation we have dealt with and probably will deal with. If you, in good conscience, think three weeks, through the distorted time measurements of the House leader, are enough, then I think our privileges as members of the opposition parties have been seriously usurped, not only by the House leader but by the Chair too.

**The Speaker:** First, to the member for Parry Sound: Indeed, I understand his argument about putting in specific amounts of time with respect to when a time allocation motion can be moved, and that does take effect with respect to second reading, but the orders are silent on any other stage. That's not to say that the House shouldn't consider such limitations, but they are not in our standing orders.

To the government House leader: Indeed I recall not one but two instances to which he replies—unhappy instances they were for all members, I'm quite sure.

Finally, to the member for Etobicoke West: I trust that he would not want the Speaker to rule something out of order which was in fact in order, and this motion is in order.

The government House leader moves time allocation. Does he have any opening comments?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I think I should move the motion.

I move that notwithstanding any standing order or any special order of the House, in relation to Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain

matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program, one further sessional day shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House. All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the clerk of the assembly by 4 pm on the sessional day on which the bill is considered in committee of the whole House following passage of this motion. Any divisions required during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House shall be deferred until 5:45 pm on that sessional day. At 5:45 pm on such sessional day, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Any divisions required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put, the members called in once and all deferred divisions taken in succession.

That, upon receiving the report of the committee of the whole House, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, which question shall be decided without debate or amendment. No deferral of any required division shall be permitted.

That one further sessional day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill. At 5:45 pm on such day, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment. No deferral of any required division shall be permitted.

That in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to five minutes.

1540

**The Speaker:** Does the government House leader have any opening remarks?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Yes, Mr Speaker, thank you, and just very briefly; I don't want to take a lot of the House's time this afternoon.

As I suggested a few moments ago to a point of order that was raised, we spent in debate on second reading on this bill the equivalent of some three weeks of normal House sitting time, and in the last week and a half the three House leaders have been through a number of discussions about how to proceed in committee of the whole with this bill and its amendments. The leader of the third party, for example, this afternoon in one of his questions to the Premier suggested that in fact we had tabled the time allocation motion before we had seen the whole of last Wednesday afternoon, and that is in fact correct.

What isn't correct in what was implied, though, is that there had been no discussion about how committee

of the whole would be handled with the opposition House leaders prior to the tabling of that motion. It was clear that the House leaders were and would be unable to reach an agreement, although as late as Wednesday evening of last week, when we had a special House leaders' meeting because we weren't going to be here on Thursday because of the Canada Day holiday, I put it again to both of the opposition House leaders that although the motion had been tabled, if we could reach an agreement—an agreement that would have had two additional days for clause-by-clause and a day for third reading instead of one additional day for clause-by-clause, one day to deal with this time allocation motion and a day for third reading, which is what we're going to end up with—I said we could have two days on clause-by-clause in committee of the whole House if the opposition House leaders were prepared to reach an agreement to that effect. The offers that I got from the other side were offers to debate each amendment for two hours or an hour and a half or an hour, which would have taken somewhere between 20 and 30 hours of House time, or the next month.

We all know, and what the member opposite from Scarborough West doesn't seem to understand, when I compare this legislation to other emergency legislation which has been imposed in the past, I compare it not in the sense of its specifics or necessarily its magnitude but of its urgency. We have unions out there, some of which are negotiating, some of which are still reluctant to negotiate and some of which are informally having discussions with government negotiators privately, all of which, though, at the end of the day, because we have an August 1 deadline, have a right to know at the end of the day what the final rules are for this set of negotiations, or lack of negotiations but imposed fail-safe.

I think it's the responsibility of this government to ensure that this legislation is amended and passed as quickly as is possible, so that those parties to this legislation, those parties that will be impacted by this legislation, whether the employers or employees, will fully understand the context in which either a negotiation and a settlement will be reached or an imposition will be imposed. It's important that it happen fairly quickly, to leave the greatest amount of time possible for those negotiations to occur.

The House leader for the third party suggested we should have had public hearings on the legislation. The input we want to see and hear is at the bargaining table, not in an all-out effort to defeat this legislation in a legislative committee, but in an all-out effort to negotiate a package that's most appropriate in the sector and the set of circumstances that confront that sector, to deal with the reduction in costs, the expenditure pressures that the government is forced to seek here.

**Mr Stockwell:** Why don't you just extend the sitting hours? Could have it done in three days.



**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Have you got a point of order, the member for Etobicoke West? No.

Are there any other members who wish to participate in this debate? Are there none from the official opposition, none from the third party? Therefore, I will recognize the member for Victoria-Haliburton.

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'm glad to lead off this debate on this side of the House about the motion that has been put forward by the honourable government House leader.

I think it is important and it is certainly interesting to note that again the government is introducing time allocation. Last Wednesday, when we were debating in committee of the whole and dealing with the issue of Bill 48, what we saw was that within a very few minutes of beginning that process, the government again initiated time allocation.

People have a very important role here to ask some questions of the government, and I would say to all those who are listening to this debate and to those who are watching what the government is doing on this issue that they need to ask one very important question. That question is: What is the government trying to do by introducing time allocation at this point?

It's very interesting that when I sat with the government not long ago, in fact a year ago, I remember all the discussions we had around the rules that were going to be brought in, and I remember asking a lot of questions because I was concerned about some of those rules that were brought in by the former House leader.

At that time I asked questions, and the questions that I asked were: How often is this time allocation going to be used by the government? If we're going to be curtailing the amount of time that members have in this House to make their points in debate, if we're going to be changing the rules so that the government, in a sense, constantly has a hammer to hammer the opposition when it wishes to, how often is this going to be used? I remember very clearly that the House leader at that time said to me: "Oh, well, it's not going to be used all the time. It's going to be used judiciously and carefully."

Every major piece of legislation that's come into this House has been dragged through this House with time allocation. They've done it specifically on those issues that were so sensitive and so contentious and so important for the people of Ontario that they couldn't have a reasonable debate. What they had to do was ensure that they were pushing this legislation through, regardless of the views of the people of this province.

As we look at what the government has done with this Bill 48, we know that of all the legislation it's put forward in this House, it is the most important piece of legislation. It has profound effects on a million workers

in this province. It is a bill which is dangerous, which is arbitrary, which gets rid of due process of law. It is a bill that not only the public service employees are concerned about, but also many people throughout the province of Ontario.

What do we see? We would think that commensurate with the importance of this bill, we would have a government that would afford the Legislature and the members of this Legislature the amount of time that they need to go through this legislation and to talk about this legislation and put forward substantive amendments that would help to change this legislation and make it better.

What in fact we see is that, as usual, the government is trying to destroy the democratic process. They are not indeed allowing adequate debate on Bill 48. They are not allowing for public hearings. They are in effect not even allowing the people of the province the opportunity to have this looked at through the eyes of the public.

1550

There are no public hearings, so what we have in effect is a government that is saying to the people of Ontario: "We do not care, John Q. Public or Jane Q. Public, whether you have an interest in this legislation. We don't care if we might help to make sure that you don't have a job in the future. We don't care if we open up collective bargaining in the province of Ontario. We don't care about any of those things. What we care about is the direction we are going in."

So it is that the government has initiated this policy and has decided for itself that it is going to continue on this policy and take away from the members of this House the opportunity to discuss this issue in a reasonable way.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the kind of importance this legislation has and how it becomes, if you will, an example of the kind of problem that we will continue to have with a government that cares not a whit for Parliament and not a whit for the process of Parliament. Every Parliament is based upon at least one factor and that is that there has to be mutual sense of cooperation. If indeed the government is to govern, as it should govern, as it should by law govern, it must try to cooperate with those members who offer the alternative view or alternative views.

Indeed, what we see in this House continually is that the government is pushing through legislation which is going to have a very major effect on people, legislation that is going to affect what people make, what people's seniority is going to be like in the future, what kind of collective agreements they are part of. They are in fact taking away the very process of law that defends those people and gives them an opportunity of being protected in their jobs and in their earnings.

What do we have then? We have a government that

cannot be trusted, we have a government that cannot be believed in terms of the kinds of priorities it puts out there, but more than that, we have a government that has believed in a total lack of faith in the parliamentary system and how that system can work in this place between all the parties.

What this brings us to is a statement that this motion that is being put forward by the honourable government House leader and by the government is basically a motion which says: "We want no more debate. We absolutely believe that the direction that we're going in with this government, that the direction that we're going in with this particular bill, is the direction that we are committed to. We do not care"—in other words, this is what the government says—"that there are significant problems out there with this bill. We do not care that workers are being hurt. We do not care even that those workers feel they have not had access to ensure that their views are known to this government and to this Parliament."

We have a government that does not care. Now, we have seen that in fact. We've seen it in their attitude. We've seen it in the kind of legislation that they're willing to put in. The workers' party is not the workers' party any more. It is not the workers' party any more. Rather, it is the party—

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** Oh, please, what about Bill 40, Dennis?

**Mr Drainville:** —it is the party of those who would continue to trample on the rights of workers. They have changed their orientation.

**Mr Sutherland:** What about Bill 40? What about the wage protection fund?

**Mr Drainville:** They call themselves a social democratic party. They are not a social democratic party. They are nothing of the sort. They have moved so far right that at this point in time, they might as well sit in the back row of this side of the House because it is their row by right. So I say to the honourable members, it's too bad that you have not been able to serve the people of Ontario the way you said you were going—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. If you want to hold some conversations, I would suggest that you go outside the House. The member for Oxford, please refrain from interjecting. The member for Durham East, if you want to—

**Mr Drainville:** Mr Speaker, I'm not going to belabour the point. All the catcalls to the contrary, all the honourable members have to do is walk down the streets of their villages and their towns and their ridings and talk to the people of Ontario. If they find among the people of Ontario that there is great support, that indeed the people are ready to say, "Bill 48's great and every other thing this government has done is great," then

they can rest secure and easy in the future.

But I would say that they should not rest so easy and secure, that the future is fraught with many dangers for a government which has turned its back on the things it said it believed in. So it is that this government is headed into a new direction.

We read in the Star just recently a wonderful article that said that Mr Rae, the Premier of this province, has a new vision for the New Democratic Party. I would say it's a disastrous vision. Until they come back to the roots they believed in, in terms of the NDP and the CCF, then we're going to continue to have problems, and the sense of betrayal about this party and this government which is rampant in the land now will only continue.

**Mr Elston:** On behalf of our party, I'm pleased to rise and speak to this motion. All too often now in this Parliament we have been beset by motions brought by the current government House leader, and by the previous one too. The hallmark of the New Democratic Party's reign of terror in Ontario will be its lack of interest in pursuing in a reasonable and progressive fashion the debates on important pieces of legislation.

There is, in my view, very—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Elston:** Mr Speaker, there seems to be a bit of a fight breaking out between these New Democrats and anybody who resists them.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Could you take your chair, please, member for Bruce. The Chair hasn't been informed if the time has been divided between the two parties. Is there an agreement?

**Mr Elston:** I request that it be divided between the two opposition parties, in accordance with an agreement.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed?

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Did I hear "no"?

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** No, you didn't hear "no."

**The Deputy Speaker:** Agreed.

**Mr Elston:** Thank you for reminding me of that, Mr Speaker.

As I was about to say, in the beginning of the New Democrats' reign here in Ontario there was some expectation that we would find a new democracy, that those people who were excluded from discussion and debate would have received a new platform, a new place to have their say in the public affairs of Ontario.

In fact, as I recall, there was great fanfare, about the end of September or early part of October 1990, as Bob Rae, in his throne speech, in his initial speech to the people as Prime Minister of this province, indicated that



there was a new democracy on the horizon, that there would be new days for those people who wanted to express their views and have their say on the public policy of this fair province of ours. It has been borne out that indeed there is a new democracy.

I can tell you that I've been here since 1981. On March 19, 1981, there was an election in which the then Premier, Bill Davis, was returned for what would be his final Parliament in the legislative annals of Ontario's history.

In those days, there was a big majority of Conservatives who did certain things in this province to deal with what was then seen to be an economic problem. Bill 179 was one of the first bills that I as a new member recall coming forward here. Mr Speaker, I can tell you that if there is a fair comparison to be made between any piece of legislation done prior to this time and this current Bill 48, there was a considerable amount of debate, and much of the debate was led by the New Democrats and several of their allies in the public or quasi-public sector. They went on not for days or weeks, not for a matter of five or six or seven or eight hours, debating Bill 179; they went on for many days in second reading, and then a number of weeks in committee as it was referred out for public hearings and then clause-by-clause.

On some of those days, I remember that the committee's clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 179 encompassed many long speeches by several members of the opposition. There were very few, if any, interjections by the Conservative Party. They merely bided their time and let us have our say.

1600

While we did not, in my view anyway, have a satisfactory resolution of the many questions which were raised about Bill 179, and later about Bill 111, which was the successor to 179 in the Davis years, I can tell you that at least there was a lot of time for us to put the case, and to put the case in a way which ensured that it was not only thorough but, I am sure, the people who would read the debates now would say it was a nauseating re-expression of several of the cases that had already been put before the public agenda in the committee.

Here we have Bill 48, and it has been brought on to implement what has been described by several in the government as the keystone of its mandate to govern for this current time.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Elston:** Mr Speaker, may I ask that we have some order here? The ministers are all busy giving instructions to their underlings.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** Jump in the lake.

**Mr Elston:** The attitude of the government members

to this has just been nicely expressed by one departing member as telling the opposition to go jump in the lake.

**Mr Sutherland:** Would you like some cheese with your wine, Murray?

**Mr Elston:** Mr Speaker, either these guys are going to sit here and listen—of course, they don't have long to sit and listen. We'll only have a couple of more hours; it's not going to take very much time. I just ask for their patience and I ask them to let me have my say on this particular afternoon, as you're shutting the entire debate off.

The member for Oxford is an interesting guy. He probably won't remember when he was in student politics and when he got to have his say in all of those committee discussions at the student Parliament at the University of Western Ontario, probably when he would make great speeches about democracy and the ability to speak freely either for or against motions. Any time a member stands up in this House and raises a voice of protest, like the member for Victoria-Haliburton did just prior to my taking the floor, these people yell and scream and hurl all sorts of insults at us, tell us to go jump in the lake or whatever because we dare to resist the overwhelming numbers these people have.

I should remind all of the people who are listening today that the motion which is being brought is really being brought under the auspices of the new rules of the New Democrats. It has been used, rather than "sparingly," as was the word used by the member for Windsor-Riverside when he was the House leader for the New Democrats—it has been used regularly, frequently and to great effect, because what it really does is ensure that no bill of any importance is left to be seen on the public agenda nor is any bill left to be examined by the public for any length of time at all, when you really think about what the parliamentary procedure is.

I was in government, along with a number of my colleagues who are now on this side of the House. The Tories had been in government, and some of their members who are now sitting here in opposition likewise shared in cabinet deliberations with Bill Davis and other people. We understand there is a public consultation that develops prior to a bill coming into the place.

The bureaucracy and the political party in power will undertake very wide deliberations, but none of those deliberations are as open to the public as the deliberation here in the people's council chamber. That's all this place is. It's a council chamber. It's an open forum where people can bring their issues to be aired. Here the real business of the day is brought to this place by the executive council.

The Premier, through his Finance minister, has brought Bill 48, which is designed to deal with the remuneration paid to some 950,000 public servants or quasi-public servants, and they have determined that,

after all the time they have taken, they now are going to prescribe that we have less time to consider it, that the public has less time to understand each of the clauses than they themselves have taken.

I even think there are a number of members from the New Democratic Party who would like to have some of the answers that have not yet been forthcoming from either the Finance minister or the Premier. I was interested in examining some of the Hansards of the past days when Lyn McLeod was putting very specific questions to the Finance minister and to the Premier about the operation of the Bill 48 clauses. As I examined all of those cases, the one thing that became very, very clear indeed was that there was not one whit of a sense that the Premier or the Finance minister had of how these were really going to function in the real world. There isn't a sense that they know what is going to happen when the new amendment to section 33 is brought forward that talks about those people in the broader public sector and in the public sector employment forces who are going to have the ability to extend contracts up to March 31, 1996, if they have the right to strike.

Here's a very simple question, a straightforward question at least. It may not have had a simple answer in reply, if an answer had been given, but the Premier decided that he would just fly off the handle, that he would turn to yelling at my leader, Ms McLeod, because she had dared to ask him to account to the public for how his legislation was going to act. That is the only thing that has occurred so far in this chamber. When we have put questions, there has been an attack of a nature which I have not seen from a government for many days, for many years, in fact, in my time in this House. But that is what the Premier is doing. He lashes out at his critics. He pooh-poohs those people who ask questions about how this will function in an Ontario that has a fairly long history of collective agreements governing our workplace activities. I don't understand it. Members of my caucus and members of the caucus to my left physically, to my right philosophically, don't understand it either.

I have got countless pieces of correspondence from people who represent a number of the affected groups, who are basically asking the question, how can we accomplish this task with Bill 48 being the guide we are to use? I have no intention of reading any of these letters. I don't think that would be productive, because a number of the questions have been raised by my leader, Lyn McLeod, in her questioning of the Premier. But basically they say: "We can't have a collective agreement. It's overridden by 48. We don't know what the targets are any more because there are moving targets that the government has put up. Sometimes you can get a benefit if you come to an agreement locally early. Sometimes you will find that you will be dis-

counted in the amount of money that you will be expected to find and turn back to the provincial coffers, but if you do that, there's no indication of where the balance of the money will be made up." There are questions about how Bill 48—this is the bill right here—how this bill will actually operate in the real world.

I had a series of amendments, which I see unfortunately I have misplaced, but a huge number of amendments have been raised by the government. That is not to mention the additional ones which have been raised by the third party, but those amendments have been brought forward more to salve the uneasy conscience of those people who supported the New Democrats on second reading.

The third party knows full well that it has very little, if any, prospect of having any serious consideration of its amendments by the government whatsoever, basically because it has been moving in its amendments that certain sections be deleted and otherwise, before any of its other amendments can have any force or effect at all. We know the government is not planning to play along with this third-party game in filing these amendments. We know that Mr Rae refused to accept any of the amendments today in the House. We know that the only thing the government is willing to pass is Bill 48, with a few other changes which the government, even as late as last week, discovered had to be made to make its bill somewhat more palatable to some of the affected groups.

1610

As the government goes on from day to day finding new batches of amendments to bring forward, it is telling the public, by bringing this motion, that there is nothing further to discuss with respect to Bill 48. Now Bill 48 will be given, after today, one more day in committee of the whole to deal with the vast number of amendments which have been brought forward by the Minister of Finance and the amendments brought by the third party.

We in the Liberal Party knew very well that the government would not have any time whatsoever to consider anything from the opposition parties. We knew that the bill itself was in such a state that it could not be repaired by any number of amendments, even if the government were willing to accept those amendments being brought forward.

There are so many places that have caused concern in the administrator's heads out in those sectors, whether it be the municipal sector or the hospital sector or the public sector, that nobody right now has an understanding of how they are to attain their new goals, yet we find that we cannot go ahead and ask, section by section, for the Minister of Finance's explanation as to how this bill would affect our new world.

This is an unusual time for us in Ontario. We had in



1984 a Canada which was just newly coming to grips with the election of Brian Mulroney, and some of us here are wise enough to keep the old clippings in which he talked about sacred trusts and talked about guarding the integrity of the programs which many of our senior citizens and others in the country of Canada have not only come to expect to be there to bolster them against problems which they have not foreseen, but those programs which have become part of the culture and character of a Canada which has become known throughout the world as a very caring society.

Well, we saw what happened with Brian Mulroney. His sacred trust soon evaporated as he played his numbers in Ottawa and as he took aim at some of the groups that were least able to protect themselves against the Tory onslaught. It hasn't been that long ago that I heard a number of federal Conservatives talking about reinstituting user fees. Can we recall just for a second how the new Prime Minister, Kim Campbell, and the then contender for what has become her place, Jean Charest, both volunteered that user fees were something that was on their minds?

Today in this House, as a result of the social contract and related matters which are being sponsored more or less under the auspices of Bill 48, we heard Mr Wilson, the member for Simcoe West, asking the Premier and others—it ended up that the Health minister answered, I guess—about user fees for seniors and the costs that were going to be associated with the new world of New Democratic Party support in the health policy field.

You see, the sacred trusts of the Brian Mulroneys of our history have now become the sacred trusts of the Bob Raes of our present. The sacred trusts, the universality, the accessibility of health care to all, have crumbled in the face of pieces of legislation like Bill 29 and, more specifically, under the auspices of Bill 48, which really provides the framework for cutting away at the very basics of our society.

Bill 48 is really not a shot across the bow of those people who administer public programs and who ensure that we are able to receive as citizens the assistance of the public purse to defend ourselves against problems that are not of our own doing.

Who in this country could have thought that the New Democratic Party, which spawns such interesting programs in the province of Saskatchewan and other places, which have been followed in other areas, would have found the New Democrats in Ontario pulling them apart, tearing at the very fibre of those social support systems which I would have thought to New Democrats would have been described likewise as sacred trusts?

Who would have thought, when you looked at 1984 and the great hue and cry that was raised by my friends in the New Democratic Party who sat in the third party position in 1984—that was before the 1985 election when we were the official opposition, Liberals. New

Democrats were in the third party under Michael Cassidy, now down in Ottawa someplace. I guess he's actually up here in Toronto sitting on the board of directors of Ontario Hydro, yelling and screaming about the sacred trust and the violations which have occurred under the auspices of Brian Mulroney. Well, here with Bill 48 is not a shot across the bow of our social support system but a shot amidships, one designed to explode the entire system that we now know.

There isn't much to be said about the dedication of the New Democratic Party, as we now find it today, for the sacred trusts which all of us shared so dear. They have today not only said they are not interested in preserving the sacred trusts—the supports for health care and social services, the support for assisting people who need a little bit of help to make sure they can do the best they can—they have instead filed this motion with the table last week and now moved it today, under the auspices of the government House leader, to make sure that their worried consciences will not be bothered by too long a public deliberation over the ramifications of Bill 48. That is probably one of the worst condemnations for any political party, that it is unable to accept public debate over its public policy.

I was, as I have said before, a member of the Peterson government. I was proud to serve with David Peterson in times that were seen to be economically very good. We had certain initiatives which we were able to take and in fact in those days, as Minister of Health and then later as the Financial Institutions minister, I was condemned roundly for not doing enough for people; that there were more things that ought to be done; that there was more money to be put into all kinds of programs. Those people in the New Democratic Party were leading the charge.

Not far behind them were the Tories. The Tories have always been a little slow off the mark on social contract issues but, in any event, they were there. All three parties were pushing for more to be done and we broadened the base of our social support systems, never dreaming that a mere five years later the New Democrats would be tearing entire strips out of the very heart of our social support programs by refusing to tell us the real world was about to disappear under their—

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** Try to get it right.

**Mr Elston:** Oh, the member for Middlesex is grumbling again. She, like Bob Rae, has a real badge to wear. She's torn apart Middlesex county. She assisted in making sure it was all annexed, and in those days there were certain steps taken to make sure we didn't have a lot of time to debate the Middlesex county bill. Well, it's just another example of how little concern they really have—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Elston:** Oh, and the member for Oxford speaks up again. He has arisen from his sleep. He doesn't want to read the debates that were printed before about the speeches New Democrats made about how debates should go on and be free and open. I'm glad he's here today and I'm glad he will be back to vote in favour of closing off the debate on this, because it will look good on his CV when he goes back to the people in Oxford, when he goes to tell those people at the Oxford Centre just exactly what he did to defend them and to defend the people who are there, when he goes to defend himself for the types of problems that are going to be the result of Bill 48.

What clause-by-clause is supposed to do is to examine each of the sections of this bill one by one so that people can understand what will take place. When we were dealing with sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, we did not get very many good answers. In fact, very few answers came from the Finance minister and from the member for Oxford, because the member for Oxford, you see, is the parliamentary assistant and he stood in for the Finance minister.

I watched with great delight as he leaned over the table to accept his advice from the public servants as to what he could say and what he couldn't say in regard to Bill 48. In any case, if we look at his answers, we'll find there aren't too many solutions being provided by the material that was pulled from the New Democrats on Wednesday last as we examined Bill 48 in clause-by-clause.

That was the day, by the way, that we had gotten government notice of motion 8 tabled.

1620

**Mr Peter North (Elgin):** This is a filibuster—

**Mr Elston:** The member for Elgin is asking some questions, Mr Speaker, and I think that the member for Elgin ought to ask some questions.

If we could be involved in committee of the whole House, if we had committee of the whole House in which to pose those questions, he could get some answers that I'm sure would help him and would help the member for Middlesex, who is again sort of agitated over something. It's probably because she's part of this whole crew that has decided that there will be an end to freedom of speech, and she is in fact probably going to be one of the ones who will vote in favour of cutting off public debate. That's the way this world is turning under the New Democrats. I can remember when members of the OSSTF and their group would have stood up and said something about the end of public debate and the end of discussions that allowed the public to be involved in them, but the member for Middlesex now will probably vote in favour of 48 because it serves her purposes, and it serves the purposes of the government, because the government cannot tolerate dissent. A group that was built on the

whole basis that they had a different idea about the way this world would run has exhibited the least amount of patience with dissent that I have ever seen in this House.

As I said, I was elected in 1981, and I happened to be here when Bill Davis's group had an outstanding majority, a huge majority. I think there were 34 Liberals and I think maybe 20—I'm not sure. I don't see any of the then members of the NDP caucus opposition here, but I think there were about 20. But all the rest were Tories. There was a huge number. There were six Liberals elected brand-new members in 1981, and 22 new Tories were elected, but I'll tell you, they went at their business the way the executive council told them.

But there was one thing that I have to give Bill Davis credit for. Bill Davis let us talk. He let us have our word. He didn't much give us our way, but he at least let us get in this place or in the committees downstairs, and we could bring in as many witnesses as we wanted, we could have as long to discuss the issues with those witnesses as we wanted and everybody could say at the end of the day, "While we were not allowed to have our amendments passed, we were allowed to have our amendments presented," almost without exception. There were, I think, at the tail end of some of our debates on 179 and 111 some motions to rise and report, as I recall, which closed off our debate, and we had, I think, the usual and obvious interjections from the opposition parties, including New Democrats, who talked about Bill Davis being heavy-handed.

I'll tell you, Mr Speaker, nothing that was done then compares to this. Here we are with what is really the cornerstone of this government's current agenda, and we are told that one day of committee of the whole is all that we can have following this motion.

That's important for the people in the Ontario public service sector to know, and the health sector to know, the community services sector to know, the schools sector, the colleges sector, the universities sector, the agencies, boards and commissions sector and the municipalities sector. I've read from Bill 48, section 3; that is the list of the sectors that will be affected by this particular legislation.

This legislation, by the way, is a fairly unusual departure from the collective agreement world that we know, as I said once before, but it's so much more an unusual departure because the New Democrats are moving it. The New Democrats are putting an end to collective agreement in this province, at least for the time being, as we know it.

Heaven help us if the New Democrats are ever able to get re-elected, because there will be a total end of all collective agreement. There will not be a need for any kind of collective coming together, because the New Democrats want to control everything. There is not a single iota of evidence that would suggest that these



people will not abandon their old ways. They are in fact proving that they have abandoned their old ways. They have totally, totally negated any of the previous—what is it, 35 years since you changed your name from the CCF to the New Democratic Party? Is it 35 years ago that you tried to preserve your birthright by changing your name, and now, under a new name change, you have sold your birthright for power? That's what you've done.

You've taken away the ability of people in this place to speak, and if there was one thing the founders of the CCF wanted to protect, it was the right to speak, it was the right to dissent; it was the right for New Democrats and for Liberals and Tories and those people who didn't have any affiliation with a political party to speak out against what were seen to be excesses in government, the excesses of the executive. Well, there is, here in this forum, a place for us to speak out against those excesses still, but not very much of a place to speak out, because the new standing orders put in place by the member for Windsor-Riverside and his cohorts in the New Democratic Party have really provided a contained way of dealing with legislation.

They no longer think it's right that anybody should talk against their legislation. If you talk for more than a couple of days at a time, these people bring in a time allocation motion not unlike the one that we see here. The only difference, of course, between this one and the other ones is that this one has been brought while we're in committee of the whole House, and generally they only let us get to second reading before they time-allocate us. In that situation, I have to say that with respect to other bills they at least let us go to standing committee under the auspices of the time allocation. Here, we didn't take an opportunity to go to standing committee on Bill 48, and these people still bring in time allocation. I don't understand exactly what these people expect us to accomplish in examining these clauses if they are to close us down at the first sign that we have some real, penetrating questions about the operation of any of their sections.

I think you should go back and examine the Hansard of last Wednesday, because you would have seen that there were a number of very good questions asked about the operation of this act. There were a number of questions asked about how people were going to reach the targets that were being set by the Minister of Finance, and when he was here he was grappling, diligently but not very effectively, with the question of how you deal with the exemption of those people making \$30,000 and less from the target, or at least from the operation of the constraint package which he had formulated.

There are still a number of questions outstanding about how this operates. For instance, what happens if I share a job with a person and that job together really

only gives us \$58,000 total, but as a result of the division we only make \$29,000? It's interesting to note that there has not yet been a definitive answer given on how that affects us. It would seem that if I'm the administrator of a particular school or hospital someplace that was trying to understand how the \$58,000 salary was to be addressed, I would probably be told that it is going to be subject to a reclaiming of compensation by the province. But because the two people who are working there are supposed to not be affected adversely by this legislation, it would seem that I could appeal, as a member of the workforce, to a better adjudication of my rights under the legislation. But that's an outstanding question, a question that is not answered, a question that will remain unanswered.

What about the question of how the hydro rates are going to be affected by the \$100-million target that has been added to their constraint package? As you know, I represent Bruce county, in which the Bruce nuclear power development is located. Today, there will be a meeting of the members of CUPE and others as they examine the very issue of how the social contract, so-called, is going to be affecting their livelihoods and futures.

As you already know as well, those people, the members of CUPE and the members of the society, are already working in concert with the management to restructure Hydro in a major task which has been designed to yield to the people of the province a 0% increase in their rates. Well, they are a long way down that road. There were targets set of some 4,500 people being let go from Hydro or retired or whatever, or at least no longer being employed there because of severance packages and whatever. But on top of that target now falls \$100 million, and the people up in Bruce county are saying, "How does this affect us?"

1630

When I asked that question and when my leader, Lyn McLeod, asked that question, there was no answer, just a bunch of verbiage which said: "It will be done. We believe in the goals of Hydro and we believe in blah, blah, blah." But there was no advice from the Premier when he was asked; there has been no advice on that issue from the member for Nickel Belt, the Finance minister, on that issue.

What about the case of the Bruce County Board of Education? The Bruce county school board has been busy trying to trim back, not unlike the trimming back that has been occurring in the Simcoe area and was raised in a statement to this Legislature earlier in the day by the member for Simcoe East. We have found several hundreds of thousands of dollars, in fact I think it goes very close to \$1 million, in Bruce county, on deliberations which preceded the implementation of the whole series of discussions that have been described as a social contract.

The issue is, are those findings that have been located by the people in the Bruce county board to be part of their target under social contracting constraint? Are they going to be credited? If they are not to be credited, how in the world are they going to find more? How are they going to find more when they are being required to deliver certain programs which the government says we cannot cut?

What is it that these people are afraid of when we ask such good questions like the question raised by my friend the member for Mississauga West the other day? Last Wednesday, in his place, he stood and said to the Premier: "Under the auspices of Bill 48, certain things are to occur. If, as is the case in Mississauga, a \$6-million target cannot be discovered under the ambit of all the provisions of Bill 48, and there is a problem as a result of those people who work in the municipality who earn \$30,000 or less, what are the things that can be done to make up the difference?"

The Premier had no answer. It was a reasonable situation for him to be in, because the answers that have been given by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to whom the Mississauga people had resort were that they could lay off people, that they could negotiate more than the 12 days which have been prescribed by legislation, that they could cut programs or that they could raise taxes. All of those things were suggested by the public servants at the Municipal Affairs ministry to members of the staff at the municipality of Mississauga.

All of those areas are areas in which the Premier or the Finance minister or one of the people in the caucus had from time to time made statements about: "You're not supposed to give more than the 12 days off. You're not supposed to be able to do that because the legislation says 'up to 12 days.' You're not supposed to cut service." In fact, I have talked to a number of people in the hospital area who have been told they can't do certain things, that they must provide the services that are there.

We're told that they're not supposed to lay off people. I remember that statement being used the last time there was a settlement with the nurses in the Bruce county area. The Premier said, "There will be no layoffs." He just forgot to say, "By the way, we're not going to pay for it." In the end, there was no money in the hospital sector and a good number of women in my area were laid off. They were terminated. They lost their jobs as a result of Bob Rae and his people refusing to come through with the money which would fulfil the contractual obligations of the hospitals to nurses. What happened? As a result of those layoffs, service levels have been cut in various ways as the belts tighten in those particular areas.

What's the final option? The final option is to raise taxes. Well, Bob Rae is not raising taxes after his budget, he said. Remember Spot-on Floyd, the Finance

minister? "Spot-on" was his favourite word a while ago. Well, Spot-on Floyd has said several times that this was a very aggressive taxing budget. He knows it, he's honest enough to say it and I applaud him for saying that. But then he said afterwards that there will not be tax increases levied against the people of the province. Uh-uh, not by Floyd, but under the auspices of Bill 48 the only option that municipalities or school boards have to make sure that the level of service is maintained is either to lay off some people, which cuts services, or basically to raise property taxes.

Floyd is right. Spot-on Floyd won't raise any taxes in this province after his budget, but he's going to force municipalities to raise taxes if the level of service is to be anywhere close to the level that it has been. He's going to force the school boards into finding more money, in fact, paying him money back, and the only way they can do that, under several of the options I have seen for the boards in my area, is to ask for more tax revenue from the people of Bruce county. So Floyd's not raising taxes but he's telling municipalities in Bruce, "Raise your taxes," and he's telling school boards, "Raise your taxes."

Conservation authorities: Does anybody remember conservation authorities in all this social contracting? They're not getting any help. They're getting their conservation land tax rebate program cancelled—you know that—under the auspices of one of the other programs that has been part of the Finance minister's great game here in the province of Ontario.

They have a special provision. What are their provisions that they can resort to? They get their money from very specific places, like levies from municipalities. If they don't get the conservation land tax rebate program, then they're going to have to go back in one fashion or another to municipalities, and they will probably raise their taxes or there will be a huge deficit. Under the auspices of all those, the scenario is not to have the Finance minister raising taxes.

Under Bill 48, it looks like the answers to those questions are fairly obvious, that Floyd won't raise taxes but that he will force other people to raise them for him. The reason he's raising them is because he's telling those individual municipalities and school boards to send the money back to Queen's Park, "or, in another way, we're cutting you off."

In fact, they started July 1, Canada Day. What an ironic time to start a new tax grab. Not only did he cut the transfers, but he also inserted a double whammy on those of us who receive paycheques. Instead of a 3% yearly surcharge increase, it is at 6% to make sure that he gets us for the entire year. That first cheque in July is going to be an interesting one for those of us who look at the various areas in which the provincial share will be set out. Actually, I hope there is on some paycheques someplace in this province a line that says,



"This is due to Floyd's increased taxes." It's a double taxation that is really part of this whole Bill 48 operation.

I'm concerned that in the end what will happen is that this bill will go through without several important questions being asked. We have started on sections 1 through 4 and we asked a whole series of questions, some that were very unsatisfactorily answered. We have the first amendment to section 5, and we go on from there, section after section with bits and pieces. I think it goes all the way up to section 51. In fact, it does. The only section we won't pose a question on is section 51, and that's the section that says, "The short title of this act is the Social Contract Act, 1993."

To be quite honest, we've already determined a long time ago that there is nothing about this particular legislation that should allow it to masquerade as a social contract. This is actually a social assault, that's what it is; a social insult as well, if I might add. Throughout the rest of it, we have questions about every section that appears in here, and section after section is leading us to believe that this is a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation. Our examination of section by section we are sure will show the government how badly it is deceiving itself if it really thinks this is going to deliver anything like a real saving to the people of the province.

Some of us have been in this place longer than others, which is a very interesting observation, I'm sure, to everybody, but when you have some history in this place, as you have, Mr Speaker, when you have had some time to listen to people debate when I think the speakers were really good speakers—I think you will remember, I think you were here, Mr Speaker, when Jim Renwick was in his best days.

1640

Jimmy Renwick was the member for Riverdale, and he was a fellow who I liked to listen to. When we were allowed to debate in this House, Jimmy Renwick was great. He was able to resort to all of the arguments about the ability to speak freely. The member for Riverdale for the New Democratic Party was generally the person who stood up and talked when the Conservative majority in those days was trying to beat down Her Majesty's loyal opposition, the people who were guarding the public interest against those fiends who were occupying the executive council chair. In fact, in those days we even saw ourselves as helping the backbenchers for the Tories, because we would give them all the good lines they could use back in the back roads of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, as it was known in those days, Mr Speaker.

Jimmy Renwick made some great speeches, and I wish you would go back as members of the government party now and read some of Jimmy Renwick's speeches, because he is one of the few people I served with who, when making an argument, could almost move you. He

had a great passion for the type of freedoms which he believed in and which actually brought him to the New Democratic Party. I don't know that he was always a New Democrat, but he certainly was a New Democrat, and he stood in his place and he held forth in such a way that you would have thought that even Bill Davis would have voted for him. In fact, Bill Davis probably was watching in his office and decided not to come down to debate it, because Jimmy Renwick would have won the day as he held forth.

I used to enjoy listening to Mel Swart when he was making those arguments when we were being cut down, cut down in the sense of debate time. Mel would stand up over there and would get up on his feet and would go right at the Conservative government of the day and tell them what a nasty bunch of people they were for cutting into debate time. I'm not speaking for Mel. Mel is with us and well; at least I'm hoping he's well. He can deliver his message personally to the New Democrats of the time.

I liked to tell Mel Swart that he was an inspiration to me, if not my guiding light, because while I liked his enthusiasm, I didn't always like the direction in which his enthusiasm went. But there was one thing about Mel: He had his say and he stood his ground. I served in committees where he stood his ground nobly, because he was allowed to in many ways by a government party that resisted putting the boot down too early. No matter when the boot went down under Davis, we always thought it was too early, because we thought that we had more good things to say. But it was never so early as it has been under the New Democrats. It was never so early under the Tories as it has been under Bob Rae and the people who no longer believe in allowing individuals to speak their mind against them, or those people who believe it's necessary to point out what is wrong with their legislation.

This legislation has been well described by my leader. Lyn McLeod said in the opening of this committee of the whole debate, as she observed on sections 1 through 4, that the fundamentally flawed nature of this bill makes it imperfectible. You just cannot make this thing work. No matter what you do to it, you really have to scrap the whole thing and throw it out and then come back with a new arrangement.

Had the arrangement been, as was suggested by my leader, Lyn McLeod, about two and a half or three months ago, that you would set your targets and let the local organizations all sit down, employer and employee, and arrive at their own local decision, then this whole shemuzzle wouldn't even have had to take place. Lyn McLeod had the right idea and she continues to put it, just so that Bob Rae, when he stands and blathers away about not having any helpful advice for his purposes, is reminded that the solution to his problems are found at the local level and are found in

the sage advice of my leader.

What we have instead is Bob Rae being uneasy and unwilling: uneasy about our criticism and unwilling to accept our criticism. He is unwilling to find out section by section that there are holes in this particular legislation of a sort which will make it fundamentally unworkable. It's unthinkable that because of that uneasiness he has decided that he will shut off all debate. There was even some suggestion that some of the late amendments that hit us last week have come from the fact that he thinks he can buy some goodwill of some of the groups that have told him they are not interested in his social contract and the discussions at some of these social contract tables.

There is some suggestion that there are things that Bob Rae believes he can sort of drop out in the public that will solve all of his problems. If he believes that, if he thinks he can solve his problems, I would suggest that Bill 48 will leave problems for all of us in this House. As legislators, each one of us will be getting letters from our school boards, from our health units, from our hospitals, from our municipalities, from all of the social service agencies that will be unable to find the dollars that Floyd Laughren and Bob Rae want to have brought back to Toronto.

Already we have heard from a couple of New Democrats about some of the issues in their areas, but most specifically we are hearing more and more from Liberals and Conservatives just how difficult it is for people to comprehend how their worlds will work under the auspices of Bill 48. When we stand in our place in committee of the whole House and ask a question on section 1, which really sets out the purposes of this bill, and we ask the Finance minister to answer some of these questions, we are merely repeating some of the questions that have been put to us as legislators or that have been written to us in correspondence from various people who are involved in the public sector or the broader public sector in providing services to the people of this province.

I don't know how anybody could accept that, under section 1, the purposes clause of this bill, we are encouraging employers, bargaining agents and employees to achieve savings through agreements at the sectoral and local levels primarily through adjustments in compensation arrangements. This doesn't encourage it. In fact, with some of the amendments that are being proposed by the New Democrats, it will prevent anybody from really coming to a table and sitting down and locally defining how they're going to work their way out of this, because this really overrides all of the collective agreements that we have in the province of Ontario.

I think most of us laughed as we read the last part of section 1. Paragraph 4 of that section reads, "To provide for a job security fund." There was a good question

asked by my friend from Scarborough-Agincourt last week, really asking the Finance minister to agree that the job security fund has nothing to do with job security whatsoever. You see, the job security fund is designed to top up unemployment insurance. It's designed to pay people not to work. It's designed not for job security but for the insecurity because of the lack of a job.

When we ask questions like that, we are trying to flesh out the real meaning of this bill and the operation it will have for people. There are some people in the public sector who say, "Bob Rae says there's a job security fund; ie, my job will be secure." But that's not true, and in clause-by-clause examination we discovered that in fact this isn't a job security fund, this isn't a fund that will help people retain their jobs.

If we cannot have some time to examine other sections, the truth won't come out about this bill. The operation of this bill and the way it will confuse the delivery of social services and public sector services won't be known by the public for several months. We will see people disappearing from their positions of importance in delivering public services. We will see that the offices where people used to be will be vacant and that phones will go unanswered. We will see that there will be problems in conducting police services in our places, and we all know how important policing and fire services are to municipalities.

**1650**

In fact, I should just relate that as I was going about my duties on July 1, Canada Day, when we were renewing our faith in Canada by celebrating our 126th anniversary, I was able to stop in to several municipalities and I had, as I was doing some other business, a chance to speak to some local police officers in one of my municipalities. They indicated they have been through a long series of discussions in the municipality designed to protect the local taxpayers against huge tax raises. So what happened was they took a freeze on their salaries and they have not filled some of the positions.

Their questions to me were: "What do we do now that we've taken a pay freeze? And since we must have police services, how can we take days off when it's going to cost us more to pay our replacements than for us to be there? How can we guarantee the local citizenry that their policing service will be available when it is most needed?" They are confused about the operation of this bill, and there are other places in which that confusion also reigns supreme.

For me, this motion is ill-timed. One day is all we spent. Less than an hour in committee of the whole was all that we were given before this motion was dropped on us. It was the heavy hand, and I urge all to vote against this type of democracy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** I wish to thank the honourable member for Bruce for his



participation. Further debate.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I don't think it's for me to comment on the Liberal position or lack of position. In fact, having listened to the last presentation, it's obvious the Liberal Party has not supported any of the government's initiatives over the past period of time. They fight the social contract. They have fought the expenditure control plan. They fought the budget. They've offered no alternatives. So to comment further on their position is to just use time unnecessarily.

My plan here at this time, first of all, is to make it very clear that I'm extremely unhappy on behalf of our party that the government has felt it necessary to bring in a time allocation motion which will end the debate on Bill 48 as of tomorrow for the committee of the whole and on Wednesday, or whenever they call it, it will be all finished at third reading. We seriously oppose this, and we felt that there would be an opportunity for debating our amendments and other parts of the bill and that time just doesn't seem to be made available to us.

I want to make very clear as well in prefacing my remarks today that I really have no desire to support, prop up or back the Bob Rae government in any way. I find the government has been detestable in the way in which it's run this province down over the last couple of years since it's been in power.

Notwithstanding that, when the government brings forward any bill or any amendment, I'm prepared, and our party is prepared, to back it if it's the right thing to do, and that was very much the case that our party had, as the member from Oakville will testify. We were prepared to go on record as supporting the right thing the government is doing, and are still prepared to do that, based on what happens in the deliberations on third reading.

The government has truly offended our sensibilities in so many things. They brought in a budget which is the largest budget in the history of the province for tax increases. Over \$2 billion will be collected. They brought in a budget that spends more than last year. Many people don't remember this. The government today, in spite of the \$6 billion that is being saved through the social contract, through the expenditure control plan and the other \$2 billion in additional taxes, is still spending \$160 million more this year than last year. In other words, the government is spending some \$6 billion more with all these control programs. I mean, it's just an incredible situation that we've got.

I'm not able to support a government that has done so much damage to health care, to the environment. Bill 143: Don't call yourselves environmentalists. There are enough issues—Bill 40 on the labour legislation. I can think of a hundred reasons I would vote against any bill this government brought in, yet out of a sense of

conviction that there be honesty and integrity in the House, our party supported second reading of Bill 48 to give a chance to see if the intention of the government is truly honourable and the government is going to try to save some \$2 billion out of the whole broader public service; then we would be part of that kind of saving.

What has happened is that, since then, the government has brought forward its bill, and we have a series of amendments that would very definitely affect the bill. What I want to do today is spend the time, because of the limitations imposed upon us tomorrow and the next day, to describe our positions in some detail.

The Social Contract Act, Bill 48, is deficient in a number of respects, but most criticism from our party has been focused on three major areas. Briefly, these are:

(1) The bill gives too much power to the Minister of Finance, particularly with regard to his authority to designate sectoral frameworks. The minister's powers are extensive and our amendments, as you will see shortly, are in some way to take away those powers of the minister so that he does not have such a huge megapower as this bill has implemented.

(2) The bill's provisions for the negotiation of the sectoral framework will allow public sector unions to win concessions on management rights which will outlive the restraint period and undermine the ability of public sector managers to manage. Why do we want to allow the government at this point to make fundamental changes in negotiations over the long term which really have little benefit in the effort of the government to save \$2 billion through the social contract per se? Rather than open up the agreements to such an extent, rather than changing the fundamental framework under which our unions are working with the government, let's remove that opportunity for the government to do some changes which are again against the best interests of the long term.

(3) This Bill 48 will not achieve any permanent reductions in the cost and size of the Ontario public sector but will simply defer costs to after March 31, 1996. At that point, public sector employers will have to confront a large cost overhang caused largely by the special leave provisions and the suspension, as opposed to the cancellation, of pay increases due after the freeze date.

It's just the accumulation of all the moneys that are going to have to be spent out at the end of this three-year term. It really means you're going to have a pent-up spree ready to take place. We're concerned about the short-term, panic nature of the bill and would be much happier to see more of a long-term revision of expectations of public spending.

The amendments that are being brought forward—and I have some 18 that I'm going to touch on now. The

amendments of our party will address and, if adopted, would rectify each of these major problems by:

(1) Establishing an objective test of the level of employer and employee support for a plan which the minister must apply before he can designate a plan as a central framework. Our point then is that there is an objective test, a framework in which the minister has to work. He can't just come along and use his emotions or, again, his political sense. He's going to have to look at a scientific, technical approach to considerations when decisions are being made on the sectors.

(2) Our amendments would eliminate the Trojan Horse. It's a section in the bill which presents a very real threat to management rights and has nothing to do with reducing compensation costs. So we're seeking to eliminate a very large section of this bill.

(3) We want to strike out the costly, awkward and complex leave and special leave provisions and impose instead a hiring freeze stringent enough to achieve real and permanent reductions in the size and cost of the public sector but flexible enough to protect essential services.

(4) We want to make the restraint program more accountable and transparent by imposing on the minister a reporting requirement. There has to be some coming back to the Legislature, so we have put together a very special motion there which will again allow the government on a regular basis to report back to this House, which should be kept informed on all that's going on through this process.

(5) Broaden the focus beyond compensation costs through the establishment of an expenditure review committee with a mandate to, among other things, evaluate all government programs and develop a priorities list for cancellation, cutbacks or privatization.

1700

That's really one of the long-term objectives: We have to continue to look for ways of making government more effective. Not to do so is to fail to look at the opportunity we have right now. The private sector is doing it. The private sector has to do it. The private sector doesn't have the money to continue to operate in the way it has in the past, and so it's being forced to streamline, cut back and do things differently. What we want to do is to see something of the same kind of business methods being applied inside government. Let government look more like business, not get more into business. This is some of the thinking behind our amendments.

There are 18 amendments in all. The first one is still in draft mode and it will have to do with section 7 of the bill. What this will do is it will mean that the government, as it pertains in particular to the medical community, will not be able to cause the medical community—that's doctors and health care providers

and various groups—to be affected by more than 5% of a reduction. It will limit the reduction to 5%, rather than going beyond that number.

Therefore, the 5% figure which has been presented by the government would be equitable all across the government and not something that is going to be applied differently for one group or another. Therefore, our first amendment will restrict the amount of reductions the government can go to for any group to 5%, and therefore would remove some fundamental inequity that is part of this bill.

As we look at the different sections of the bill, and because I want to put this on the record to make sure that people are aware of some of the content and the thinking behind our amendment, I will go through them, try to explain them briefly. If we have an opportunity tomorrow, when the House is looking in committee at the amendments, I might have a chance to move them more quickly. I know, by virtue of the way the debate is structured, that we are going to be very, very limited in how much we can do in the time that's allotted.

Our second amendment has to do with subsection 11(3), where I will move that subsection 11(3) of the bill be amended by deleting the words "in the opinion of the minister." In removing this section, what we're saying is, again, that the minister has such tremendous freedom to do what he wants. Rather than just giving him—or it might be her at that time. Rather than giving the minister such unlimited opportunity to play with the legislation, to play with the intent behind the legislation, to do things that are not said right now, we would rather have things defined, delineated and clear here in the Legislature so that we then know for sure what it is the minister's going to do.

Therefore, our effort in our second amendment is to remove some of the tremendous scope of freedom that the Minister of Finance would have in this bill, to remove the words "in the opinion of the minister." That means he's going to have to tell us beforehand. In fact, the bill itself would have restricted him by the limitations therein.

Our third amendment has to do with paragraph 11(3)1 of the bill. This has to do with the framework of the whole bill. In Bill 48, this paragraph says that the minister may designate a plan as a sectoral framework if, in his opinion, there is sufficient support for the plan demonstrated during the negotiations.

There is no threshold test imposed on the minister, no indication that the plan would have to have the support of a majority of the employees or employers in a given sector before the minister could designate a plan. So the minister is able then to again, if he just has a sense of certain things—I asked him about this in the finance and economics committee the other day and he almost just gave the answer as, "Well, trust me."



Rather than trust him, what I want him to do in this amendment is to bring in—a shortcoming that we see—“The minister shall not designate a plan as a sectoral framework unless the plan is supported by 50% of the employers who among and between them employ 50% of the employees in the sector in which the plan is intended to serve as a sectoral framework.”

Therefore, if you took the teachers' bargaining sector as a unit, if the minister thought, “I see that Metro is coming this way and York region and Peel; I think we can call them a sectoral framework,” no; we would then, by this amendment, make it necessary for the minister to look at, as it would say in the motion, “...the plan is supported by 50% of the employers who among...them employ at least 50% of the employees in the sector for which the plan is to be designated as a sectoral framework.”

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that there is a solid foundation for a plan in a sector before the plan is designated as a framework. The amendment is based on the assumption that it will be easier to implement measures to achieve the expenditure target if those measures are genuinely supported by employers and employees in the sector. So the framework would be more clearly defined as to who then can be considered by the minister as a sectoral group. Our amendment to 11(3)1 of the bill would cause that to take place.

Our fourth amendment is to paragraph 11(3)5 of the bill and has to do with the treatment of different classes of employees.

This subsection of the bill states that before the minister can designate a plan as a sectoral framework, he must be of the opinion that, “The plan treats different classes of employees in a fair and equitable manner.” That's the exact wording that he has here within the bill in paragraph 5; “The plan treats different classes of employees in a fair and equitable manner.”

When he's describing the sectoral framework, what we really start worrying about is when you're saying, are you going to treat some people differently? What classes of people are you talking about? What is fair and what is equitable? Is this the kind of clause in a bill that leads to litigation by other groups wherein people come along and say, “I don't know what you mean by it”? Is it any wonder that it might have different interpretations?

What we have done is that the PC amendment would strike out this fine-sounding but vague provision and our amendment simply is: I move that the bill be amended by striking out paragraph 11(3)5. What that would allow us to do is cause the government to remove that from consideration. At least we'd be voting against it and this is one way of doing it.

As we proceed, the fifth amendment is to subsection 11(4) of the bill dealing with special circumstances.

This subsection says that the minister does not have to apply any of the criteria for designation of a plan as a sectoral framework. Do you get that? He doesn't have to apply anything that's there in writing in the bill. The minister doesn't have to be of the opinion that sufficient support exists for the plan or that it treats different classes of employees fairly or otherwise. If the minister is of the opinion that—this is a quote from the bill—“special circumstances apply and it is desirable to designate the plan as a sectoral framework,” then he can do it.

The term “special circumstances,” which is part of this bill, is not defined. While the government will argue that the intention is to provide flexibility, the effect is to give the minister the authority to designate a sectoral framework where none exists in fact. Thus the minister can pre-empt the fail-safe simply by saying that in his opinion, because of the special circumstances that exist in his own mind, it makes it desirable to have a framework in place. That special circumstance may have more to do with the political interests of the government in avoiding the fail-safe as often as possible than with anything else.

The PC amendment would strike out this section and thereby deprive the government of its political convenience. Very simply, this section of the bill would be struck out. That's subsection 11(4) giving the minister special powers.

I'm moving through it, but some of these become very cumbersome and large. Our sixth amendment has to do with section 12 of the bill. It's a very large section of the bill that deals with the sectoral framework. This section of the bill sets out the provisions which may be considered by persons seeking to negotiate a sectoral framework. These provisions include organizational restructuring; improvements in productivity, including the elimination of waste and inefficiency; alternate work arrangements; binding resolution of disputes; sharing of information, including financial and planning information and decision-making by employers and employees; sectoral bargaining; sectoral and local-level joint committees; pensions, including joint trusteeship of pension funds; and any other provisions proposed by a party to the negotiations.

1710

Some background: When the social contract process was initiated in March of this year, our leader, the member for Nipissing, Mr Harris, warned that one of the dangers of the process was that it could be used by the government to achieve measures which would make it more difficult for public sector managers to manage and to implement the deep structural reforms needed to improve the cost-effectiveness of the delivery of publicly funded services and programs. That is, in order to achieve short-term concessions on compensation issues, public sector employers would have to yield on issues

like contracting out, job guarantees and repatriation.

Section 12 of the bill shows that these concerns by Mr Harris were very well founded when he talked about them some time ago, because this section now legitimizes the negotiation of all these matters and other matters as part of the sectoral framework process; any of these other issues that shouldn't necessarily be on the table when you're dealing with a financial concern or financial cutbacks can now be placed on the table during these negotiations.

Because many of these issues have little to do with the primary objective of the bill, to save money by reducing compensation costs in the broader public sector, our amendment would delete this section. We would vote against this section.

Matters dealt with by the section which would reduce cost, protection for the whistle-blower and sharing the rewards of initiatives which eliminate waste and inefficiency with employees are covered in other amendments we'll be bringing forward.

We see this section 12 as the Trojan Horse. It is this one section that the government can use to play games with the whole public service over the next couple of years. This is the section which can advance the union agenda in the province of Ontario in a way that has never been advanced. We see it as a Trojan Horse in this bill: By bringing it into the bill, it will allow them to creep out along the way with all the socialist union agendas that we are opposed to. It is extraneous to the legislation; it is not necessary to the legislation. We would therefore see section 12 of the bill deleted.

After all that, our few words really amount to this, as our sixth amendment: I move that the bill be amended by striking out section 12.

But all that is just to explain why we are opposed to section 12. Section 12 is the Trojan Horse of this government. We see section 12 as a very dangerous set of provisions where the government can then allow a lot of things to go on within the central framework that have not got anything to do with the financial concerns that are really the intent of this bill. So that is how we would deal with our sixth amendment.

I'm now on to our seventh amendment. Our seventh amendment has to do with another clause in the bill. I will refer to it specifically, number 7, and I point to this section.

**Mr Sorbara:** Press the rewind button and go back to the beginning.

**Mr Cousens:** It was just outstanding, wasn't it, Gregory?

Section 23(2) of the bill has an awful lot to do with very special circumstances. Throughout the bill, if, within a sectoral agreement, the government is able to have people live within the context of those people who are under \$30,000 in income per year so that they can

be considered to be protected under the bill, then let that be the case. But there are situations, there are people within different municipalities where they are not protected.

Indeed, I have a quote from the mayor of Woolwich. The township of Woolwich "has 46 full-time employees, but only 17 of them earn more than \$30,000, meaning the majority are supposed to be exempt from the provisions of the province's so-called social contract. Woolwich, however, is being asked to reduce its payroll by \$115,494. That leaves 17 people who would have to bear the brunt of the whole" cost reduction for that township. What's happening is that in the township of Woolwich it's impossible, under the guidelines of the bill, for that township to be able to fulfil the intent and the terms of the bill with the number of people who are making over \$30,000 a year.

We've asked that this section of the bill, which is subsection 23(2), be removed, struck out from the bill. It would mean that small municipalities, where the bulk of the employees make under \$30,000 a year and where those smaller municipalities have to make up the 5% on a smaller compensation package, could in those circumstances cause even those who are under \$30,000 a year to participate in the cost reduction.

That being the case, it would mean they don't lose their job. It means they don't lose their job. We're more interested in people having a job when this is over and continuing to do something rather than see people suffer and be hurt. That's part of the reason for this amendment. You can't just start saying "to hurt people"; that is not where we're coming from.

It's something that becomes part of the whole bargaining arrangement; everyone would participate in the cost reduction. Removing this section of the bill would make that possible. So that is our seventh amendment:

I move that the bill be amended by striking out subsection 23(2).

Our next amendment, number 8, is a very large amendment, with a considerable amount of discussion that would have to take place on it. As we begin to look at it, what you're really talking about is that the rollback of 5%—the goal of the government in the social contract is that there would be an across-the-board rollback on the part of all groups in the Legislature and the province of Ontario, in the broader public service; that everyone would be somehow backing out from this. There would be a 5% saving for all.

What we are saying is that the rollback would be applied to all groups so that the wage component for the provincial transfers would be frozen at a level 5% below current levels. What we're really trying to do is give an incentive to employers and employees working together, who can apply wage savings to financing increases in compensation at the local level, with the



amount and distribution being negotiated by the employer and the employee. In that way, the wage savings would be distributed.

I want to read this amendment, because the chance of getting to it later—I'm worried.

I move that the bill be amended by striking out section 24 and substituting the following:

**"Wage rollback**

"24(1) Subject to subsection (4), the rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning on the first anniversary of the agreement falling on or after August 1, 1993, fixed at a rate 5% lower than the rate that was in effect immediately before that anniversary."

This is a 5% rollback. As we look at what the 12 days amounts to, this is another way of accomplishing the saving for the province of Ontario. The government, as you will see in the next motion, is bringing forward the 12 days, which is just not going to satisfy the long-term goal.

**"Employees not bound by collective agreement**

"(2) Subject to subsections (4) and (7), the rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is not bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning August 1, 1993, fixed at a rate 5% lower than the rate that was in effect immediately before August 1, 1993.

**"Reductions in transfers to employers**

"(3) An amount that is payable by the crown in right of Ontario or by the government of Ontario to an employer for compensation purposes shall be reduced by 5% on the first anniversary date of the collective agreement falling on or after August 1, 1993, in the case of employees subject to a collective agreement, or on August 1, 1993, in the case of employees not bound by a collective agreement and shall be fixed at the reduced level for a period of three years from that date.

1720

**"Increase in compensation**

"(4) During the three-year period established by subsections (1) and (2) employers and employees may apply any wage savings realized as a result of improvements in productivity and the elimination of waste and inefficiency to financing compensation increases, with the amount and distribution of the increase to be negotiated by the employers and the employees."

In other words, other moneys that can be saved and found can be applied to the social contract. The government has resisted looking at that. Continuing:

**"Promotions**

"(5) Nothing in this section prevents increases in compensation as a result of a promotion or acting promotion of an employee to a different position.

**"Existing agreements**

"(6) If a collective agreement existing on August 1, 1993, provides for increases in compensation after that date, those increases are cancelled."

**"Expired collective agreement**

"(7) If a collective agreement has expired before August 1, 1993, and on that date the employees that were formerly bound by it are without a collective agreement, the compensation of these employees is fixed at 5% less than the amount that they were receiving under the last collective agreement in force before August 1, 1993.

**"No first collective agreement**

"(8) If employees are represented by a bargaining agent and a first collective agreement has not been concluded before August 1, 1993, the compensation of those employees is fixed at an amount 5% less than the amount that they were receiving immediately before August 1, 1993."

That amounts to our amendments on section 24. We would strike out the existing section 24 and substitute the above for that. What we would have accomplished then is that there be a rollback across the board—hard, painful, but at least everybody holds on to his job. It's another way of accomplishing this without the problems that you're going to see that are all part and parcel of the next stage of what the government's looking at.

There is a great deal of confusion out there. When we look at some of the correspondence I have—I have a letter here from the chief executive officer of the Georgina Public Libraries. He said:

"There are five employees here who will have to bear the brunt of a \$22,000 cut as a result of the social contract.

"To translate that net result, that means the five employees will have 23.48 unpaid days between now and the end of the year!

"Where is the justice in that?

"Is this the true intent of Bill 48?"

What we're trying to do, instead of having that kind of example—I mean, that's real life out there, where the only way in which they can accomplish the goal of the government in the reductions that have been proposed is that they would have some five people taking 23.48 days off. It just isn't possible. It isn't practical. Why then not look at another way, which would be, as painful as it might be, a 5% rollback? That is part of what we've suggested there.

I have more examples of it, but because of the time limitation I want to continue with our other amendments.

The other amendment we have, proceeding to our ninth amendment, is to sections 25 to 32 of the bill. These have to do with leave and special leave provi-

sions and the hiring freeze and expenditure review committee. These sections of the bill, which provide for up to 12 unpaid leave days a year and for the special leave provisions for essential service personnel, are among the most contentious elements of the legislation. The leave provisions, if the full 12 days are taken, amount to a 5% pay cut—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. On a point of order, the Minister of Transportation.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** I have studied with a great deal of zeal the standing orders of this distinguished Legislative Assembly of Ontario and, alas, I'm somewhat appalled and shocked for I see under committee of the whole House that the mace should be in a different position and you should be closer to the table, Mr Speaker, because although I listened very intently, the member for Markham keeps introducing amendments and we're not in committee of the whole House. I'm seeking your direction—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The direction of the Chair is that we are not in committee of the whole. We are debating the government House leader's motion to limit debate and I believe that the member for Markham's participation is very much relevant to that. Please continue, the member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** The issue is that these are the reasons why our party would very much like to see a continued debate to this bill, and because of the closure motion we are not going to have another chance to put them on the floor of the House. Therefore I'm taking advantage of this very short period of time in order to at least put on the record the intent of our caucus in supporting the second reading of this bill, our hope and sincere expectation that the government will look at our amendments and will support them, and that being the case, we will be able to accomplish the objective of the social contract and proceed.

As I continue now on our ninth amendment, what I wanted to talk about is that the sections of the bill which provide for up to 12 unpaid leave days a year and for the special leave provisions for essential service personnel we believe are among the most contentious elements of the legislation. The leave provisions, if the full 12 days are taken, amount to a 5% pay cut for affected workers, and the special leave provisions will contribute significantly to the cost deferment imposed by the bill since the special leave day off can be banked and carried forward when the compensating days have to be given with pay. So at the end of the three-year period, how many—and I don't know, but how many—employees in the broader public service will have been able to accumulate 36 days off with pay, which then have to be paid three years hence?

The PC amendment to section 25 would strike out the leave and special leave provisions and substitute instead a stringent freeze on hiring in the broader public

service, which would realize significant and permanent compensation savings and literally force the broader public service institutions to restructure their operations.

Our amendment, the Progressive Conservative amendment, would allow for staff complements in essential or regulated services to be maintained through an exemption from the freeze, but the exemption would only apply to positions designated by cabinet.

Third, the freeze would use the attrition rate instead of the leave provisions to reduce compensation costs. The attrition rate in the broader public service is approximately 2% annually, which over a three-year period would cut the size of the broader public service in Ontario, where there are more than 900,000 people, to some 56,000 positions less, or about 16,000 positions more than the government says would have to go to hit the expenditure restraint target. These 16,000 positions would be used as a cushion to maintain staff levels in essential and regulated services.

In the third year, the freeze would save more than \$2 billion in compensation costs, and the cumulative savings over the full three years would be in excess of \$5 billion.

So this motion, which is a very serious amendment, would be a hiring freeze across the broader public service, allowing the government to have a cushion to hire where necessary.

To that end, the PC amendment to create a new section 26 of the bill calls for the establishment of an expenditure review committee with a mandate and a timetable. This expenditure review committee would:

(1) Develop a method of preventing year-end burnoff. What a shameful display of burnoff we saw in the Ministry of Housing, where we've had our leader raise this question, and a member from Mississauga, on the whole business where it's recorded in minutes of Housing agencies where they want to get rid of all money left over near year-end. Our motion here would do something to prevent year-end burnoff.

(2) It would do something to protect people who are trying to improve the system. It's called by the unions whistle-blowers' legislation. I'd rather think of it as being something more to protect people who can make constructive suggestions to help things go better.

(3) Reward employees who make suggestions which help eliminate waste and inefficiency.

(4) Conduct a broad program review and make recommendations for reductions, cutbacks and privatization.

I don't know whether I can get all of this amendment into the time that I have, but our amendments to sections 25 to 32 of the bill would be that we strike out sections 25 to 32 of the bill and substitute for them a number of different sections. A section on restriction on hiring:



"25(1) Subject to subsection (2), no employer shall, during the period of three years beginning on the date on which this act receives royal assent, employ any person who was not employed by the employer immediately before that date.

"Exceptions

"(2) An employer may employ a person described in subsection (1),

"(a) if it is necessary for the employer to do so in order to comply with a provision of an act of the Legislature or the Parliament of Canada or a regulation made under such an act that requires the employer to employ a specified number of employees; or

"(b) if the employer would not be able to provide an essential service unless the employer employed the person.

"Designation

"(3) Clause (2)(b) does not apply to allow an employer to employ a person unless the position in which the person would be employed is one that has been designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or is one that is a member of a class of positions that has been so designated.

"'Essential service' defined

"(4) In this section 'essential service' means a service that is necessary to enable the employer to prevent,

"(a) danger to life, health or safety;

"(b) the destruction or serious deterioration of machinery, equipment or premises;

"(c) serious environmental damage;

"(d) disruption of the administration of the courts; or

"(e) disruption of any publicly funded service."

1730

There is enough scope in those provisos that would allow the government to carry on business even through attrition and through not hiring. There would be that opportunity for the government, where necessary, to bring other people in as per those provisos.

Then we would also set up an expenditure review committee.

"26(1) A committee to be named the expenditure review committee in English and Comité d'examen des dépenses in French is established.

"Composition

"(2) The committee shall be composed of three persons appointed by the Minister of Finance, one of whom shall be designated by the minister as chair of the committee.

"Exclusion

"(3) The minister shall not appoint any person who is a member of the Legislative Assembly or an employee of the crown.

"Appointments

"(4) The appointments shall be made not later than September 1, 1993.

"Member unable to serve

"(5) If any member of the committee becomes unable to continue to serve on the committee, the Minister of Finance may appoint a substitute."

Now let's look at what the expenditure review committee would do.

"Duties

"(6) The committee shall"—these are very important amendments to the whole intent behind this social compact, the legislation. Dig this, Mr Speaker, the government has not begun to look at some of the restructuring that needs to go on in a modern public service.

"(a) conceive of a method of preventing administrative units of the government of Ontario that have their own budgets from attempting to spend to the limit of their budgets if such spending is not necessary to the performance of the tasks assigned to the units, particularly where such spending would occur near the end of a fiscal year."

That's the proviso that would end year-end burnoff.

"(b) conceive of a method of protecting employees of government institutions from reprisal on the part of the institutions for having disclosed the existence of acts or omissions that constitute gross mismanagement or that cause a waste of money or other resources."

This is a way of protecting those people who would have suggestions to bring in. In fact, during the social contract discussions before this became a bill that was brought to the House, a number of suggestions were brought forward by people and yet the government hasn't looked at it, and I think people are reluctant to bring them forward. This would be a way in which the expenditure review committee could look at those suggestions and bring back proper recommendations for cabinet to consider.

"(c) conceive of a method of rewarding employees of government institutions who, individually or collectively, make recommendations that lead to a reduction of expenditures or a conservation of resources through the elimination of waste or an increase in the efficiency or cost-effectiveness of the operations of the institutions."

In other words, let's try to get people to help us run the government more efficiently and effectively. That's what this kind of committee would be doing.

"(d) review all programs"—and this one bears repetition.

"(d) review all programs administered and services provided by the government of Ontario and identify any programs or services that should, having regard to the desirability of efficiency and cost-effectiveness, be,

"(i) eliminated,

- “(ii) reduced in scope or scale, or,
- “(iii) transferred to the private sector.”

That's the kind of thing that the member, Mr Carr, has brought forward in our caucus, saying: “Let's not try to have government try to do it all. Get the private sector involved and let's allow people in government to review programs, review what they're doing.” So this whole business of reviewing all programs would be a very, very important part of what this government should do.

People forget. The government keeps spending our money. It keeps on adding new programs. There is never a sunset clause. We want to have some way in which we look at the whole picture of the province of Ontario. This kind of committee would begin to do that.

“Report

“(7) The committee shall submit a report to the Legislative Assembly,

“(a) on the matters referred to in clause (6)(a), on or before December 31, 1993;

“(b) on the matters referred to in clause (6)(b) and (6)(c), on or before March 31, 1994;

“(c) on matters referred in clause (6)(d), on or before March 31, 1995.”

What we've done is to say over the next three years, the next two years, there would be sufficient time for the government and this committee to look at ways of eliminating services, reducing services, scaling them down or transferring them to the private sector.

Finally:

“Definition

“(8) In subsection (6), ‘government institution’ has the same meaning as ‘institution’ in the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.”

That is our ninth amendment.

Our 10th amendment is one of those that if the government accepts our previous amendments—it has to do with subsections 33(3) and (4) of the bill—they wouldn't be necessary and they would therefore be removed.

Our 11th amendment is where the bill will very seriously look at what's happening with OHIP. One of the major fears we have is that the government has been dealing with different groups differently. Instead of just limiting the scale-back and reductions to 5% across all groups, what they're doing is picking on the doctors or picking on the pharmacists or picking on some other subgroup. Maybe it's the teachers. So a number of our amendments, as we look at section 36 of the bill, will protect those groups so that they're not going to have more than the 5% tacked on to them.

The chance of ever getting anything done in the House with the narrow, short time frame that we've got will mean that it's going to be next to impossible to do.

It therefore becomes necessary to put these motions on the table today, otherwise they will be lost to the Legislature.

I move that the bill be amended by striking out subsection 36(1) and substituting the following:

“Reduction of OHIP fees

“(1) An amount that is payable to the Ontario health insurance plan for an insured service rendered by a physician or practitioner or in or by a health facility may be reduced by the amount which the joint management committee determines is necessary to achieve a reduction in total OHIP fee payments equal in percentage terms to the compensation reductions in other sectors.”

In other words, rather than take the chance that the government is going to pick on the doctors, we're putting the word in here so that the government can only reduce to the amount of 5%. That's one they should accept. It's going to be fun to see what they do, because I can see by the smile on Mr Mackenzie over there, the Minister of Labour, that he thinks, “Cousens, I don't think I'm going to do anything for you.” But I don't know. I'll tell tomorrow.

The second one has to do with another amendment to protect health service operators. It's subsection 36(2) of the bill, “reduction of similar payments.”

I move that the bill be amended by adding, following the words “prescribed amount” the words “to a maximum of 5%.”

What we've really done again is for people in health service operations, if this amendment is accepted, and we will move it and seek to have it moved. We will be supporting it as our caucus. I wonder what the Liberals will do. I'm not going to worry about them. They'll probably be voting against everything. At least when the legislation comes in, it would be nice to see some protection for different groups across the public sector.

Our 13th amendment is to subsection 36(3) of the bill. It has to do with independent health facilities. Again, it's self-explanatory.

I move that the bill be amended by adding following the words “prescribed amount” the words “to a maximum of 5%.”

In other words, independent health facilities will not be cut back more than the 5%. That's what this amendment would cover there.

Our 14th amendment has to do with pharmacists. It's to subsection 36(4) of the bill, reduction of dispensing fees.

Any chance of getting any motions in this House with this time limitation is very restricted and that's why I am taking this opportunity to do it now.

I will be moving that the bill be amended by adding, following the words “prescribed amount” the words “to



a maximum of 5%."

Part of the concern that we have is that the pharmacists have really had some very, very serious problems with this government. If you'll notice the Ontario Pharmacists' Association, it withdrew from the social contract and drug reform talks. It had to do with Bill 29 and what the government is doing in another bill, unrelated to this.

I quote from their news release. It has given the government "complete power to unilaterally set the professional fee paid under the Ontario drug benefit program to pharmacists, even on the basis of where the pharmacy is located, despite any agreement that may have been reached between the association and the Ministry of Health."

In other words, the government throws away all other agreements, sets them aside and does what it wants. Is it any wonder that the pharmacists have removed themselves from the social contract considerations? It's no wonder at all. What we want to do is to find some way of protecting the pharmacists. There isn't one of us who doesn't have to go to a drugstore and there isn't one of us who doesn't want to be able to look them in the eye and know that those people are there to serve our community. Why does this government want to pick on them? Why? Maybe they'll support our amendment, that the bill be amended by limiting to a maximum of 5%. The pharmacists have been blindsided by this government in Bill 29, a completely different bill. We want to do something here to protect them and help them out.

1740

I'm running short of time because of the number of amendments we've got.

We have another amendment, and this amendment is subsection 37(1) of the bill.

"Reduction of OHIP income levels

"37(1) If a maximum amount payable by the Ontario health insurance plan in respect of services rendered by a physician, practitioner or health facility during a given time period has been established by agreement, the maximum may be reduced by an amount to be negotiated by the joint management committee but the amount of the reduction shall not exceed five per cent."

In other words, once again the medical profession needs to have some protection on this. Everybody thinks they're rich. They're just as poor as the rest of us, and it's a matter of working it through in fairness.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Oh, yes, yes.

**Mr Cousens:** Aha. See, there they are; the New Democrats, let it go on the record, are saying, "Get the doctors." Who was it who said that? Indeed, Drummond White, Durham Centre. Don't come along and think you can start picking on any group more than another.

**Mr White:** Don't say that. Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The member for Durham Centre, do you have a point of order?

**Mr White:** The member opposite has identified me by name and not by riding. Secondly, at the point that he was saying something, I agreed with him. I said, "Yes," with what he was saying. I don't know how the member can interpret that as in any way defaming any group in our community. For the member to make a false statement such as that on the floor of the Legislature, besmirching another member's honesty—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Drummond, travel the 12 feet. Don is travelling the 12 feet.

**The Speaker:** The member for Markham indeed has indicated his apology, but it would be helpful if the member for Markham would direct his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr Cousens:** That's fine. It's good that you've made that statement. I'm delighted. We sometimes worry about people attacking other groups in society, and you've made it clear that that's not your intention, and I thank you for saying that.

Our 16th amendment has to do with Ontario drug benefit plan limitations, and we will move that subsection 37(2) of the bill be amended by adding, following the words "the prescribed amount," the words "but shall not exceed five per cent."

In other words, again the bill will restrict the government from going beyond 5% with these groups. We have evidence that the government is going after some groups more than others. Let's protect them. Put it in the legislation so that they're not being picked on.

Our 17th amendment, clause 41(1)(e) of the bill, moving that the bill be amended by striking out clause 41(1)(e) and substituting the following:

"(e) designating a position or class of positions for the purposes of subsection 25(3)."

This is a consequential amendment that has to do with the others being successful. I don't even understand that one myself.

The 18th and final amendment that our caucus will be putting forward is quite an important amendment in that what we're asking for is a new section to the bill, section 48 of the bill, which will be a requirement for an annual report.

The bill does require that the administrator of the job security fund report to the Finance minister annually on the operation of the fund. However, there is no requirement for the minister to make a report on the overall program back to the Legislature.

Our amendment will force the government and the Minister of Finance to make an annual report to the House on the status of the restraint efforts, including on

the progress being made towards achieving the sectoral expenditure reduction targets and on any changes to the targets which the minister believes are necessary.

Our amendment is a very simple one, moving that section 49 of the bill be amended by adding the following new section:

“Annual report

“49. The Minister of Finance, for as long as this act is in force, shall table in the Legislative Assembly an annual report on the progress made by the government and the sectors towards meeting the expenditure reduction targets, any recommendations concerning adjustments to those targets which in the opinion of the minister are warranted, estimates of the number of jobs lost as a consequence of measures implemented pursuant to the act and any other information which, in the opinion of the minister, is relevant to providing the Legislative Assembly, the sectors and the public with an objective assessment of the effectiveness of the restraints imposed by this act.”

If we can have accounting by the government on an annual basis, what may happen is that the government may withdraw this bill. In two years from now we may not need Bill 48. Things may be picking up, and so if we have an accounting along the way next year and the year after—mind you, it might be an election in 1995; there has to be one by then anyway, when the New Democrats go back to the public—at least there would be a public accounting here in this House, in this assembly, so that we'll know how the program is working. It would then give us an opportunity to make amendments or other changes as we saw necessary. It would give us a sense of how many jobs were lost, how much hurt was done, what is really happening in the province, so I sincerely hope and believe there's going to be a forum of participation by the government on our amendments, that this one amendment which will cause the government to have an annual report on the progress that is being made with regard to Bill 48 will be something we have before us.

Eighteen amendments by the Ontario PC caucus: I want to thank our leader, Mr Mike Harris, for the excellent leadership he has been demonstrating in this House, as painful as it is for him to support Bob Rae and this government on second reading. We wanted to put on the record that at least the government was moving in the right direction to reduce the deficit by \$2 billion and that every one of us, members of the Legislature and members of the broader public service, would participate in an honourable and honest way in order to see that those reductions are made. Our amendments are an effort to address those concerns and are an effort to make it equitable and fair for all and an effort to get the government to where it really wants to be.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Markham for his contribution to the debate.

Mr Charlton moved government notice of motion number 8, standing in his name, a time allocation motion with respect to Bill 48. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members; a 15-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1747 to 1802.*

**The Speaker:** Would all members please take their seats.

Mr Charlton moved notice of motion number 8 which stood in his name, a time allocation motion with respect to Bill 48.

All of those who are in favour of Mr Charlton's motion will please rise one by one.

#### Ayes

Abel, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Duignan, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard;

Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziembra.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to Mr Charlton's motion will please rise one by one.

#### Nays

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Caplan, Carr, Conway, Cousens, Cunningham, Drainville, Eddy, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harris, Johnson (Don Mills), Jordan, Mahoney, McLean, Morin, Murphy, O'Neil (Quinte), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Offer, Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Poole, Runciman, Ruprecht, Sorbara, Stockwell, Sullivan, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson (Simcoe West), Witmer.

**The Speaker:** The ayes being 63 and the nays 35, I declare the motion carried.

It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 1807.



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

Member/Député(e)	Constituency/Circonscription	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North/-Nord	ND	deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement
Akande, Zanana	St Andrew-St Patrick	ND	parliamentary assistant to the Premier / adjointe parlementaire du premier ministre
<b>Allen, Hon/L'hon Richard</b>	Hamilton West/-Ouest	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère du Développement économique et du Commerce
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses
Beer, Charles	York North/-Nord	L	Chair, standing committee on social development / Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South/-Sud	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Northern Development and Mines, parliamentary assistant to minister responsible for francophone affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines, adjoint parlementaire du ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
<b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon Marion</b>	London Centre/-Centre	ND	Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues / procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	L	opposition deputy House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	Chair, standing committee on general government / Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales
<b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon Elmer</b>	Hastings-Peterborough	ND	Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South/-Sud	L	Progressive Conservative deputy House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	L	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South/-Sud	PC	
Carter, Jenny	Peterborough	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship / adjointe parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques
<b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon Brian</b>	Hamilton Mountain	ND	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement et délégué à l'Assurance- automobile
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West/-Ouest	L	Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
<b>Christopherson, Hon/L'hon David</b>	Hamilton Centre/-Centre	ND	
<b>Churley, Hon/L'hon Marilyn</b>	Riverdale	ND	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	Deputy Leader of the Opposition / chef adjoint de l'opposition
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North/-Nord	L	
<b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon David</b>	Windsor-Riverside	ND	
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	ND	Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien de formation et d'adaptation de la main-d'oeuvre
			parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour; assistant government whip; Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development / adjoint parlementaire du ministre du Travail, whip suppléant du gouvernement, Vice-Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources
<b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>	Niagara South/-Sud	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	Chair, standing committee on public accounts / Président du Comité permanent des comptes publics
Cousens, W, Donald	Markham	PC	opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Cunningham, Dianne	London North/-Nord	PC	
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North/-Nord	L	

Member/Député(e)	Constituency/Circonscription	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Transports
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	L	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government / Vice- Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	Ind	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Duignan, Noel	Halton North/-Nord	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Eddy, Ron	Brant-Haldimand	L	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	L	opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Eves, Ernie	Parry Sound	PC	Progressive Conservative House leader / chef parlementaire du Parti progressiste-conservateur
<b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>	Cambridge	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	L	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	Ind	
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East/-Est	ND	
<b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b>	Ottawa Centre/-Centre	ND	Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement
Grandmaitre, Bernard C.	Ottawa East/-Est	L	
<b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth A.</b>	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	ND	Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	ND	government whip; Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills / whip du gouvernement, Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi privés
<b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b>	Rainy River	ND	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	ND	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Housing; Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice / adjointe parlementaire de la ministre du Logement, Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice
Harris, Michael	Nipissing	PC	leader of the Progressive Conservative Party / chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur
Haslam, Karen	Perth	ND	
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	L	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy; Chair, standing committee on resources development / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South/-Sud	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates / Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses
Jamison, Norm	Norfolk	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development and Trade / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Johnson, David	Don Mills	PC	
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings / Prince Edward- Lennox-Hastings-Sud	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development and Trade; Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce, Président du Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques
Jordan, W. Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Agriculture and Food / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation



Member/Député(e)	Constituency/Circonscription	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	ND	
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	L	
<b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon Frances</b>	Beaches-Woodbine	ND	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
<b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon Floyd</b>	Nickel Belt	ND	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
<b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	Hamilton East/-Est	ND	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	ND	Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills / Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi privés
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West/-Ouest	L	opposition chief whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Malkowski, Gary	York East/-Est	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	ND	parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Marchese, Rosario	Fort York	ND	parliamentary assistant to the Premier, parliamentary assistant to Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: Chair, standing committee on administration of justice / adjoint parlementaire du premier ministre, adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, Président du Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South/-Sud	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies / Présidente du Comité permanent des organismes gouvernementaux
<b>Martel, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	Sudbury East/-Est	ND	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy / adjointe parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North/-Nord	L	
McGuinty, Dalton J.P.	Ottawa South/-Sud	L	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East/-Est	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des organismes gouvernementaux
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	L	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Mills, Gord	Durham East/-Est	ND	parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East/-Est	L	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la <sup>^</sup> S Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East/-Est	ND	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman / Président du Comité permanent de l'ombudsman
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour / adjointe parlementaire du ministre du Travail
Murphy, Tim	St George-St David	L	
North, Peter	Elgin	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Agriculture and Food / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
O'Connor, Larry	Durham-York	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	L	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	L	
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North/-Nord	L	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre/-Centre	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances

Member/Député(e)	Constituency/Circonscription	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	ND	parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion
<b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>	Etobicoke-Rexdale	ND	Minister of Municipal Affairs / ministre des Affaires municipales
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	
<b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>	Oshawa	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	L	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	L	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts / Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des comptes publics
<b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b>	Lake Nipigon/Lac-Nipigon	ND	Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
<b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>	York South/-Sud	ND	Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	L	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	ND	government whip; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman / whip du gouvernement, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'ombudsman
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Progressive Conservative chief whip / whip en chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	
<b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>	Dovercourt	ND	Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Sola, John	Mississauga East/-Est	Ind	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre/-Centre	L	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West/-Ouest	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre/-Centre	L	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances
<b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b>	Scarborough West/-Ouest	ND	Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	Progressive Conservative deputy whip / whip adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G & Grenville-Est	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Ward, Brad	Brantford	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances
<b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>	Port Arthur	ND	Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé
<b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>	Scarborough-Ellesmere	ND	Speaker / Président
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre/-Centre	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé
White, Drummond	Durham Centre/-Centre	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales
<b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>	Algoma	ND	Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
<b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>	Frontenac-Addington	ND	Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille et whip en chef du gouvernement
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West/-Ouest	PC	
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Winninger, David	London South/-Sud	ND	parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General, parliamentary assistant to minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la procureure générale, adjoint parlementaire du ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones



Member/Député(e)	Constituency/Circonscription	Party/Parti	Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West/-Ouest	ND	parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet; Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion, Vice-Président du Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North/-Nord	PC	
Wood, Len	Cochrane North/-Nord	ND	parliamentary assistant to Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Richesses naturelles
<b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>	High Park-Swansea	ND	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales
Vacant	Essex South/-Sud		

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Administration of justice/Administration de la justice**

Chair/Président: Rosario Marchese  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Margaret H. Harrington  
Zanana L. Akande, Robert Chiarelli, Alvin Curling, Noel Duignan, Charles Harnick, Gary Malkowski, Gordon Mills, Tim Murphy, David Tilson, David Winninger  
Clerk/Greffière: Lisa Freedman

**Estimates/Budgets des dépenses**

Chair/Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Gary Carr, Murray J. Elston, Christel Haeck, Norm Jamison, Wayne Lessard, Steven W. Mahoney, David Ramsay, Jim Wiseman  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Finance and economic affairs/  
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair/Président: Paul R. Johnson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Jim Wiseman  
Elinor Caplan, Gary Carr, W. Donald Cousens, Norm Jamison, Wayne Lessard, Monte Kwinter, Irene Mathysen, Peter North, Gerry Phillips, Kimble Sutherland  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**General government/Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair/Président: Michael A. Brown  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Hans Daigeler  
Ted Arnott, George Dadamo, Derek Fletcher, Bernard C. Grandmaître, David Johnson, George Mammoliti, Mark Morrow, Gregory S. Sorbara, Paul Wessenger, Drummond White  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Government agencies/Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair/Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Allan K. McLean  
James J. Bradley, Jenny Carter, John C. Cleary, Alvin Curling, Robert Frankford, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Rosario Marchese, Daniel Waters, Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Legislative Assembly/Assemblée législative**

Chair/Président: Ron Hansen  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Farnan  
Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Stephen Owens, Norman W. Sterling, Barbara Sullivan, Noble Villeneuve, Paul Wessenger  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Ombudsman**

Chair/Président: Mark Morrow  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Tony Rizzo  
Donald Abel, Zanana L. Akande, Dennis Drainville, D. James Henderson, Tony Martin, Frank Miclash, Bill Murdoch, David Ramsay, Chris Stockwell, Gary Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Public accounts/Comptes publics**

Chair/Président: Joseph Cordiano  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Dianne Poole  
Robert V. Callahan, Noel Duignan, Mike Farnan, Robert Frankford, Pat Hayes, Margaret Marland, Tim Murphy, Larry O'Connor, Anthony Perruzza, David Tilson  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Regulations and private bills/  
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair/Présidente: Christel Haeck  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Ellen MacKinnon  
Ron Eddy, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Pat Hayes, David Johnson, Leo Jordan, Gordon Mills, Hugh P. O'Neil, Anthony Perruzza, Tony Ruprecht  
Clerk/Greffière: Donna Pajaska

**Resources development/Développement des ressources**

Chair/Président: Bob Huget  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Cooper  
Sean G. Conway, Joan M. Fawcett, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Turnbull, Daniel Waters, Gary Wilson, Len Wood  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Social development/Affaires sociales**

Chair/Président: Charles Beer  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ron Eddy  
Jenny Carter, Dianne Cunningham, Randy R. Hope, Tony Martin, Dalton McGuinty, Larry O'Connor, Yvonne O'Neill, Stephen Owens, Tony Rizzo, Jim Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Douglas Amott





# CONTENTS

Monday 5 July 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Lou Parsons</b>	
Mr Mahoney	2155
<b>Ontario Film Review Board</b>	
Mrs Marland	2155
<b>Canada Day</b>	
Ms Harrington	2155
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Caplan	2155
Mr Eddy	2156
<b>Race relations</b>	
Mr Jackson	2156
<b>Buffalo Days</b>	
Mr Hayes	2156
<b>Simcoe County Board of Education</b>	
Mr McLean	2157
<b>Canada's potential</b>	
Mr Mills	2157

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2157
Mr Rae	2158, 2162
Mr Harris	2160
Mr Laughren	2160, 2167
Mr Bradley	2162
Mr Drainville	2167
<b>Commercial concentration tax</b>	
Mrs McLeod	2159
Mr Rae	2159
<b>Gambling</b>	
Mr Eves	2161
Ms Churley	2161
<b>International trade</b>	
Mr Carr	2162
Mr Rae	2162

## Water supply

Mr Paul R. Johnson	2162
Mr Wildman	2163

## Wage protection

Mr Mahoney	2163
Mr Mackenzie	2163

## Seniors' health services

Mr Jim Wilson	2164
Mrs Grier	2164

## Contaminated soil

Mr O'Connor	2165
Mr Wildman	2165

## Day care

Mr Offer	2165
Mr Silipo	2165

## Drivers' licences

Mr Turnbull	2166
Mr Pouliot	2166

## PETITIONS

### Retail store hours

Mr Bradley	2169
Mr McLean	2169
Mr Jim Wilson	2170
Mr Huget	2171
Mr Tilson	2171
Mrs Fawcett	2172

### Scarborough Bluffs conservation

Mr Frankford	2170
--------------	------

### Health care

Mrs Sullivan	2170
Mr Eddy	2170
Ms Carter	2172

### Social contract

Mrs Haslam	2170
------------	------

### Gambling

Mr Turnbull	2171
-------------	------

## GO bus service

Mr Beer	2171
---------	------

## Child care centres

Mr Owens	2171
----------	------

## Mental health services

Mr Carr	2172
---------	------

## Automobile insurance

Mr Beer	2172
---------	------

## Trucking industry

Mr Turnbull	2172
-------------	------

## FIRST READINGS

### Legislative Assembly Statute Law

#### Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 58

Mr Lessard	2173
------------	------

## GOVERNMENT NOTICE OF MOTION

### Time allocation, government notice of motion number 8

Mr Charlton	2173
Mr Drainville	2177
Mr Elston	2178
Mr Cousens	2187

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Visitors

The Speaker	2157
-------------	------

### Role of the independent member

Mr Mahoney	2168
The Speaker	2168
Mr Drainville	2168
Mr Kwinter	2168
Mr Charlton	2169

### Written questions

Mrs Sullivan	2169
--------------	------

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 5 juillet 1993

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

### Loi de 1993 modifiant des lois

#### en ce qui concerne

#### l'Assemblée législative,

#### projet de loi 58

M. Lessard	2173
------------	------



No. 43A



N° 43A

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 6 July 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 6 juillet 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Tuesday 6 July 1993

The House met at 1331.

Prayers.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### JURY DUTY

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I bring a matter of urgent attention to the Attorney General and the minister of government services. The General Division court is located in my riding, and it's an extremely aggressive and active court. Many jury panels are brought in from time to time to be selected for it to serve the ends of justice.

Recognizing the fact that jurors, as a result of action by this government, no longer receive a stipend until they've served 10 days, I believe it is, I have to bring to the attention of the Attorney General and the minister of government services that in fact a juror's car was towed away by local government services while this juror was sitting on a jury.

It seems to me that flies in the face of fairness to jurors as they receive no compensation. It also could impact on the question of whether or not a juror might be influenced by that to render a verdict one way or the other. I don't believe that happened, but I urge the Attorney General and the minister of government services to devise some plan, perhaps a sleeve to be slipped over the visor of the juror, to avoid this happening in the future.

I might also add that the parking lot at that courthouse is an abomination. There is a hole there that, if your car was anything other than a tank and sank into it, you'd break the axle. I find this to be totally objectionable.

Justice is a number one priority and should be for everyone in this province. I strongly urge the ministers to look at this and perhaps to find out whether there's some local problem between the local government services representative and the courthouse. If that's the case, that should be remedied promptly.

##### MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** Early in 1992, there was a great deal of excitement over a provincial-municipal cost-sharing arrangement known as disentanglement. Disentanglement was to achieve a more accountable, efficient and effective government by eliminating overlap, duplication and confusion with respect to the delivery of services and programs. The municipalities were to cover the cost of property assessment services and certain provincial highways and the province would pick up the cost of welfare allowances.

It took some time and a lot of money, but an agreement was reached in January of this year. The final

agreement was to be ready in April and implemented in January 1994.

The then Municipal Affairs minister said this exchange of responsibilities should mean savings for the property taxpayer. It sounded as though the province was doing the municipalities a favour, giving them a break, saving them money.

Then in April, the government brought in the expenditure control plan and cut millions in unconditional grant transfers. The partnership and the trust that went along with it died. The expenditure control program was followed by the social contract, which involved another round of cuts to municipal budgets.

Today we see that for the 10th straight month the number of welfare recipients increased, this time by 3,000, an incredible 21% higher than this time last year.

Since the disentanglement process is obviously stalled, I call on the minister to clarify what means are being proposed to remove the ever-growing welfare burden from the property taxpayer.

##### NIAGARA GUARDIAN

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** We had some sad news last month in Niagara-on-the-Lake, when the Niagara Guardian newspaper published its last edition.

The Niagara Guardian was an independently owned community newspaper. It was the dream of John and Tuula McPhee, which turned into reality back in 1989. For the past four years, John and Tuula have poured their hearts and souls into this newspaper. Unfortunately, despite their efforts, this small independent found it difficult to continue to compete against its chain-owned competitor in the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake during these tough economic times.

John McPhee was the managing editor of the Guardian and, as is the case with most weekly newspapers, he served as its primary reporter, photographer, editorial writer and layout artist. When an event happened in Niagara-on-the-Lake, John was there, notepad in one hand, camera in the other.

Despite the sensitivities of operating in a small community where the people you write about more often than not tend to be your neighbours and friends, John did not compromise his journalistic instincts. He wrote hard-hitting news stories and was never afraid to be critical. When John didn't agree with something you'd done, you knew it. I know about that. So did the rest of the community after reading the editorial page. Like many other public officials, I felt the sting of John's pen on more than one occasion. Yet through it all, you couldn't help but maintain a healthy respect for this talented journalist.

In these days of chain-owned newspapers, it is indeed regrettable that yet another independent has disappeared from the Ontario media scene. The Guardian may have been put to bed—and according to John that's where he's gone too, to catch up on four years of missed sleep—but its legacy lives on in the minds of its faithful readers, who feel a sense of loss when they check their mailbox each Tuesday and find the Guardian is no longer there. My personal thanks to John and Tuula.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** I rise today to talk about the disturbing tendency of this government to impose punitive policies and unfair tax and fee hikes which have a disproportionate impact on Ontario's seniors.

The NDP government has gutted the Ontario drug benefit program by removing 230 prescription drugs, many used by seniors, and is about to impose user fees on at least some seniors in this province. They have imposed rate hikes of up to 32%, as well as means testing to determine the choice of accommodation for seniors in care. The NDP government has imposed sales tax hikes of up to 10% on life insurance, home insurance and automobile insurance carried by seniors. The NDP government is withdrawing choice in home care by announcing a reduction in private sector participation to 10%. The NDP government has increased fees for vehicle and driver registration.

All of this was done without consultation and in many cases without even the courtesy of advance notice to seniors. This government must stop expecting seniors to carry the NDP's bad fiscal management on their backs, and the seniors must be protected from the chaotic economic policies of this government.

1340

#### GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I rise today to point out another example of why the NDP government has lost the confidence of the people of Ontario.

On July 26, 1990, Bob Rae addressed the board of directors for the Ontario Medical Association and said, "There is no fairness in a system that allows the government to dictate unilaterally your level of pay."

On June 1 of this year, the Bob Rae government introduced legislation that will allow the NDP to dictate unilaterally the dispensing fees paid to pharmacists.

The only thing worse than the NDP's flip-flop on negotiated settlements is the sleazy way in which it introduced Bill 29, which is designed to correct the mistakes of the Liberals by eliminating the commercial concentration tax. However, this bill also contains additional provisions that will facilitate major changes to health care in Ontario.

Instead of bringing in separate legislation, the government is attempting to make significant changes to our

health care system by tying the changes to the abolition of just one of David Peterson's 33 tax hikes. Much like Bill 50, Bill 29 will allow government bureaucrats to make critical decisions about the medical needs of Ontario citizens. Instead of consulting with pharmacists and patients, the government will arbitrarily decide what drugs are deemed medically necessary to be included on the Ontario Drug Benefit Formulary.

The Ontario PC Party will not support legislation that dictates fees to pharmacists and we will not endorse legislation that allows bureaucrats to play God with the medical needs of Ontario citizens.

#### FESTIVAL OF LIGHTS

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** Peterborough's Festival of Lights is once again in full swing. Saturday, June 26, was the first night of the seventh season of this unique festival. People brought their lawn chairs and relaxed under the sun and then under the stars. This first evening featured the Peterborough Symphony Orchestra with its conductor Stan Kopac and guest Louise Pitre. The 17 nights of the festival will feature well-loved local performers and distinguished guests.

The concert is followed by six illuminated boats doing an intricate ballet on Little Lake and a great show of prowess by the Peterborough Waterski Club. The grand finale is always a spectacular fireworks display.

Festival chairman Fred Anderson is to be congratulated. Each year the Festival of Lights gets better and better. Ken Lennox's wonderful picture of the dancing boats was an added bonus this time.

On Canada Day, the proceedings were augmented by a multicultural festival. Food from 12 different countries was available from a marquee. Huda al Haddad and her helpers are to be congratulated on this special and appropriate contribution.

The festival continues on Wednesday and Saturday evenings through the summer. It is a wonderful way to make friends and enjoy the community spirit and the talents of our city. Drop by on a Wednesday or Saturday evening soon. You'll be delighted.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orillia):** Because of time allocation, Mr Speaker, which, as you know, is considered closure in this House, tomorrow at 5:45, third reading of Bill 48 will take place. Still, no one is aware of the Conservative position on the social contract legislation.

Yesterday Mike Harris called Bill 48 a "flawed bill," and then he said, "We want to ensure that this legislation is able to pass."

It's no wonder that the Conservative position on the social contract is still unknown. The leader of the Tories, Mike Harris, is talking doublespeak. Today, the Toronto Star says that Harris is refusing to say how his party will vote. It's amazing that they have not yet



decided to vote against Bill 48.

Lyn McLeod has told you from the beginning that Bill 48 is bad, bad, bad. The Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto has told you this legislation is bad, bad, bad. Reporters and columnists are saying the social contract bill is bad, bad, bad. Are the Tories going to let Bob Rae get away with bang, bang, bang?

Come on, Mike Harris. Stop playing games. Bill 48 doesn't solve the problem; it just defers the costs for three years. You know your amendments will not fix this legislation. This legislation cannot be fixed. It is bad.

Come on, Mike, what's it going to be, yes or no? Stop talking out of both sides of your mouth. You know the bill is fatally flawed legislation. Tell the House today that you and your caucus will not support Bill 48. Help us defeat this bill and this bad NDP government.

ERIC NYSTEDT

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I rise in the House today to pay tribute to Constable Eric Nystedt of the Minden detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police, who was fatally stabbed July 3 while attending a domestic dispute at an isolated cottage at Furnace Falls, near Minden.

Pursuing a suspect through the woods, Constable Nystedt emerged with a serious stab wound to the upper leg. He later died on the way to hospital. Constable Nystedt is the 11th Canadian police officer to die in the line of duty in the last seven years.

The young man will be remembered as a friendly, competent officer who was well-liked in the community and enthusiastic about his police duties. Described by officers who knew him as a fitness nut, he was an avid cyclist and golfer and a member of the OPP cross-country racing club. At 24, Constable Nystedt was full of promise, courage and dedication.

Police officers are entrusted with the role of protecting society and upholding the values we hold most dear. We expect that one day they might have to give up their own lives to protect those around them, but we do so praying they will never have to make such a sacrifice.

Constable Nystedt's death is a tragic loss to his family, the OPP detachment at Minden, the entire police community and the province at large.

Tomorrow, the Progressive Conservative leader, Mike Harris, and I will travel to Sault Ste Marie to attend the young officer's funeral.

I know every member of this House will join me in paying tribute to the late Eric Nystedt and extending our heartfelt sympathy to his parents, Richard and Mary-Lou, and to his brother, Scott, a fellow OPP officer stationed in Ottawa.

CHILDREN OF DIVORCE

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise to tell the House

about a unique program designed to lessen misery suffered by children of divorce. The Superior Court of Cobb County, Georgia, has put together a mandatory seminar for divorcing parents.

This four-hour seminar focuses on the needs of children during a divorce. It is based on the fact that divorce is a very stressful experience, especially for children. Topics include how families experience divorce, typical reactions of children, developmental needs of children, skills to help children cope and pitfalls for parents to avoid.

We all know that children often get the short end of the stick when parents decide to go their separate ways. They often become pawns in a lifelong battle between parents who just don't seem to get along, parents who often accuse each other of acting like children. This seminar opens their eyes to the permanent damage that can be done to the very human beings they so often fight over.

The Georgia program is available two evenings and two mornings a month at a cost of \$30. It is conducted by qualified professionals from Families First, a United Way agency. I'm sure most parents would agree that the future of the children is worth at least \$30 and a few hours of their time.

I have sent this information to the Attorney General, because I think it's something our family courts should be looking at here in Ontario.

VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, the Honourable Desmond Leakey, member of Parliament for Jamaica. Welcome to our chamber.

It is time for oral questions and the honourable member for Renfrew North.

ORAL QUESTIONS

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** Mr Speaker, it is time for oral questions. My count of 10 seconds ago indicated that there were 18 members of the government, about six members of the cabinet here—

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** Where's Lyn McLeod?

**Mr Conway:** I'm here. I'm going to be asking leader's questions.

I have two questions today on behalf of my colleagues, the first to the Minister of Energy, Mr Wildman, who is not present, though he is supposed to be here. My second question is to Ms Lankin, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, who is supposed to be here. She is not here. Obviously, I'm going to be required to stand those questions down.

I understand the pressures on my ministerial friends,

but I repeat that we have a practice that indicates—and I know that Mr Hampton, Ms Boyd, Mr Cooke, Mr Buchanan, Ms Coppen, Mr Silipo and Ms Ziemba are not scheduled to be here, although Ms Ziemba is. I understand they're not to be here; we have a mechanism that suggests that we shouldn't expect that. But Mr Wildman and Ms Lankin are supposed to be here. Neither of them is here.

I will stand down my first two questions and await their arrival and encourage my friend the government House leader to get these people here quickly.

1350

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** Likewise, the leader of our party has a question for the Premier. We'd ask that that question be stood down as well.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Then we begin rotation with backbench questions.

**Mr Eves:** I have a second lead question for our party, if I may be permitted to place it.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** To the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: On May 5 of this year, I asked you how much the increased policing would cost the city of Windsor as a result of the casino project. I pointed out to you that you had that information in a report submitted to you by the Windsor Police Services Board in January of this year. This is now over six months later. How much is it going to cost?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** As I said at that time when the member asked the question, the report to which he is referring was a very early preliminary report that, I believe, was conducted by the police services board and was not presented to me. The information in that report was very preliminary, before we had advanced very far in our plans, so I don't have a cost at this time as to further police services. We do know that we have, for the time being, extended the police force in Windsor by 10. We will continue to work with the police in Windsor as we progress through the process in terms of how much more policing will be required.

**Mr Eves:** My supplementary question to the minister is: Seeing as how she doesn't have her act together from figures that were provided in January and a question that was asked in May, this one's a little simpler.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Read it slowly, so you can understand it.

**Mr Eves:** You should be talking about understanding anything.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Eves:** The reason I'm asking these questions is very simple: The government seems to be intent on proceeding with this casino project without doing its homework, without having the facts. All they know is

that they want to open this thing by New Year's Eve, 1994. That's it. You don't care about the problems you're creating in society. You've done nothing to address them. You don't know how much policing's going to cost.

On November 5, 1992, you stated, Minister, that your casino project team would be taking measures to deal with compulsive gambling. Seeing as how you want the interim casino up and running by this New Year's Eve, can you tell us exactly what procedures you have in place for those who suffer from gambling addictions, how much money you've set aside, how this is going to be administered and exactly what you're doing? Can you tell us that today?

**Hon Ms Churley:** We said from the beginning that this is one of the areas we would be looking at in consultation with the experts who deal in this kind of area. We have put together an interministerial committee to work on this, as I said, in consultation with the experts in the field. They should be reporting to me some time in July or August on the best steps to take. When I have that information, I will get it to the member.

It is not fair and not correct to say that the minister and the project team have not been working on this and in other areas and moving towards the best conclusion. As the member knows, the interim casino is not up and running yet. We are trying to look at the best process, the best program to put in place. We are consulting with other ministries to make sure that we come up with a good plan for that.

**Mr Eves:** In April 1992—this is more than 15 months ago—you said you would consider diverting some of the proceeds from casinos to the horse racing industry in the province, to charities in the province. That was over 15 months ago. Have you made a decision on that? That doesn't take a casino up and running. It doesn't take any of this gobbledygook you've just talked about. Have you made that decision or not? Yes or no? How much are you going to divert to charities in the province and the horse racing industry?

**Hon Ms Churley:** The member has his facts wrong, I must say. I have never said that we would be diverting direct funds to the charities.

**Mr Eves:** Listen. Open your ears.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Parry Sound.

**Mr Eves:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If you would be glad to check Instant Hansard this moment, I said that the minister said she would consider. I didn't say she said she would do it; I said she would consider and I'm asking her to tell me today, 16 months later—

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of order. However, I would ask the member to temper his language.



**Hon Ms Churley:** If the member would like to hear the answer, I'm willing to give him an answer. The answer is very clearly, if you'll be patient and wait just a moment, that I have said in this House for some time and I suppose you didn't hear it at that time, that the casino proceeds will not go into the horse racing industry directly or into charitable gaming. That's very categorical and very clear. We are working with the horse racing industry and we are working with the charitable organizations to see how we can all work together. We have decided—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Churley:** I think that concludes my answer for the time being.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** How does one proceed? Half the cabinet which is supposed to be here is not here. One of the ministers I want is here. I'm in your hands, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** I don't know what help I can be to the member. The Chair is not privy to lists. We have question period and any member of the cabinet is here to answer whatever questions you may wish to pose.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I will take my first leader's question then to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Yesterday morning in the national capital area a number of the interprovincial bridges connecting Ottawa with Hull were blockaded by Ontario and Quebec construction workers. There is a rising tide of frustration and anger about the ongoing attitude of the Quebec government with respect to very restrictive economic policies with respect to Ontarians or New Brunswickers or anyone not from Quebec doing business in Quebec.

My question to the minister, and my colleague Mr Grandmaître asked a similar question two weeks ago: In light of what happened yesterday on those interprovincial bridges in Ottawa-Hull, it is very clear that frustration is turning into anger. My constituents in eastern Ontario are becoming very, very frustrated about the restrictive practices being employed and pursued vigorously by the Quebec government.

In light of what happened yesterday in the national capital area and having regard to the 14% unemployment rate that the Treasurer rightly complained about in his budget of some weeks ago, what further actions or steps, as the Minister of Economic Development and Trade for the province of Ontario, do you intend to take on behalf of the working men and women of eastern Ontario who on a daily basis confront these increasingly frustrating restrictive practices being employed by the Quebec government?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I agree with the member

opposite in his characterization of the level of anger and frustration and certainly share that sense of frustration.

There are two arenas for addressing this, with respect to a negotiated process at least. The first is in the interprovincial trade negotiations that are going on in which there has been some progress with the negotiators around a number of issues. I think it's fair to say, however, that the federal government in the latest document that it tabled fell short of the mark of the concerns of the provinces, and Ontario is preparing and will be tabling next week a counterproposal which we think will have much greater support from the majority of the provinces.

In the meantime, I think the issues with Quebec, as we know on all sides of the House, have mounted, and there is tremendous frustration and there seems to be an increasing vigour with which they're applying some of their regional procurement policies and other sorts of things. We have indicated in response to the questions here that we will be meeting at the officials' level. The first contact has taken place. I expect that I will be involved in a meeting following the deputies, to commence bilateral negotiations.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister complete her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I will say to the member that if we are unsuccessful in bilateral negotiations, I would be prepared to recommend to cabinet consideration of taking unilateral actions. That would be a very serious step in light of the agreement we've made with other provinces not to erect trade barriers at this time.

1400

**Mr Conway:** Whether it's in Ottawa or in my part of eastern Ontario, in communities like Pembroke—and it's not just construction; it's the trades, some of which are the construction trades. The Minister of Transportation knows only too well the outrageous restrictive practices being employed by the Quebec department of transport affecting truckers in the upper Ottawa Valley, insane restrictions that are completely indefensible in the light of the policies of the Ontario government, which have been very open.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Time for action.

**Mr Conway:** It is clearly time for action. For the people whom I represent in Renfrew county, whom my friends the members from the Ottawa area, like Mr Grandmaître and Mrs O'Neill and others in our caucus—and I know I speak for my friend from Carleton—represent, we are running out of time and excuses because it is so obviously and so transparently unfair. To the best of my understanding, we are not having these problems on the Ontario-Manitoba border. To the best of my understanding, we are not having nearly these kinds of problems on the Ontario-New

York state or Ontario-Michigan frontier. My question, on behalf of the over 25% unemployed in the construction trades and all of the unemployed loggers and truckers in Renfrew county is, when is the talking going to stop and the action going to start?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I want to say that the members whom he mentioned and their concerns are well noted with me, as are the concerns of the member for Ottawa Centre, Ms Gigantes, who has raised this issue with me on numerous occasions and advocated on behalf of the people, particularly in the capital region, these issues of concern that have been raised.

I would point out to you that until this last number of months, there had not been a process of negotiations under way with respect to these issues for years, although members of all parties have indicated that this is a problem. The situation with respect to Quebec has not changed in terms of the application of its rules. The impact in these recessionary times is certainly much more hard felt here in Ontario.

We have an open system in Ontario with respect to trade. I think that most of us in this House want that kind of system to be in place across all the provinces. We have been involved in trying to reach that goal. We have agreed, as part of an agreement by all provinces, not to erect new trade barriers at this point in time while the negotiations are going on. I think the situation has become so urgent that we are now starting bilateral discussions with the province of Quebec. If that does not succeed, if there is no—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** —backing down by the province of Quebec, I say to the member opposite, it will be important for us to take action at that point in time, which will mean violating the agreement we have arrived at with other provinces with respect to a moratorium on new trade barriers.

**Mr Conway:** This is a particular problem we are having in eastern Ontario with Quebec. I understand that there are a variety of multilateral issues, but I repeat that I'm not hearing from my friends in the northwest of this province these kinds of difficulties with Manitoba. Let me tell you that yesterday it was a blockage on the Alexandra and Macdonald-Cartier bridges. Tomorrow, I suspect, if there is no improvement, is going to be something worse.

We have an obligation, those of us in elected office, to deal with this. Today, both Le Droit and the Ottawa Citizen are reporting that Quebec business people are advising the Ontario government to pursue retaliatory action, like New Brunswick. That's coming from Quebec business people in Hull. They're advising the Ontario government to do what New Brunswick did a few months ago, which, I might add, painful as it must

have been, has gotten Quebec City's attention.

Of course, none of us likes this, but I can no longer go home to Pembroke and tell unemployed construction people and loggers and electricians and everyone else that we're going to have an open-for-business market in eastern Ontario, while they're going to face unbelievably, outrageously inane restrictions at every level in Quebec.

My final question: Given the urgency and the specialized nature of the problem we're having on the Ontario-Quebec border, will you and your colleague the Premier invite Mr Bourassa and Mr Tremblay to a meeting in either Ottawa or Hull in the next few weeks to take this issue unto yourselves to see if you cannot work out some kind of an interim solution before we have much worse than we had on the Macdonald-Cartier and Alexandra bridges yesterday in the national capital region?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The suggestion the member makes is exactly my intent with respect to the course of action over the next few weeks. I agree with you and I think that is the important next step.

I would point out to you that the threat of retaliatory action that New Brunswick took got the possibility of bilateral negotiations started. We have already got agreement from Quebec to begin those bilateral discussions. The meeting at the officials' level to set the terms of the agenda in those meetings will lead within the next few weeks to that meeting you're asking for taking place.

I would point out to you that this issue and Quebec's treatment of Ontario and other provinces with respect to mobility of labour and regional procurement has gone on for a number of years. It is time, I agree with you, to bring it to an end. But I would point out to you that for all the years you were in government, you didn't deal with it when you had your counterpart Liberal government in Quebec. I would ask for your assistance now in dealing with that Liberal government in Quebec in talking to your counterparts there as well in terms of your own political ideological family.

I suggest to you that the best for all of Canada is for us to come out of this with a lowering of trade barriers, not an escalation of trade retaliation that would inhibit any negotiations.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I do agree with the seriousness of the issue with respect to the Ottawa region and that our position must be that if Quebec will not deal at the table in the meeting in the next few weeks, actions in response must be taken.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Conway:** There is a difference between a world of 5% unemployment and 15% unemployment. While I



accept the honourable minister's advice, I'll tell you that the people I represent understand today that their economic prospects are much more under pressure than they were three or four years ago.

**The Speaker:** Could the member place his second question, please.

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** A second question, to the Minister of Energy, responsible for the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario: Mr Minister, this morning we awakened to news that Local 1000 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees has threatened that if there are any layoffs at Ontario Hydro as a result of the social contract obligations being imposed on Hydro by the Rae government, CUPE will strike the Hydro corporation. Can the minister indicate to the House, as the minister responsible for this very vital service, what his response on behalf of the government is to this threat?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Energy):** I thank the member for his question. He will know, as I've responded in the House previously, that there have been discussions going on between Ontario Hydro and the government and those responsible for negotiations around the social contract, and that Ontario Hydro has assured us that the restructuring Ontario Hydro has already begun negotiating with the members of CUPE 1000, as well as the society of engineers, has been such that Ontario Hydro is committed to maintaining its decision not to have rate increases, and yet at the same time to be able to achieve the restructuring without further dislocation than was understood to be part of the restructuring already.

#### *Interjections.*

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** What question is he answering?

**Mr Conway:** Did Jim Bradley really have a brother with a beard? I'm like Mr Stockwell; I'm trying to figure out what question you were answering with that verbiage.

Let me be a little more direct. Can you, as minister responsible for Hydro, indicate whether or not in recent days, since the announcement of the \$100-million target for Hydro, you have discussed with, met with or corresponded with Mr Maurice Strong as chairman of the Hydro corporation, and has Mr Strong committed on behalf of the Hydro board to meet those targets of \$100 million worth of savings in this year?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The answer is yes. I have had discussions, as have other members of the government, with Mr Strong and senior executives from Ontario Hydro. As I said in my earlier verbiage, to use the member's term, Mr Strong has committed to maintaining the position Ontario Hydro took with regard to rates, to maintaining the negotiations with CUPE 1000

on the restructuring that Ontario Hydro had already initiated, and to meeting its targets under the social contract.

1410

**Mr Conway:** That's a very helpful clarification, very helpful.

We are left with the apparent situation that Hydro is going to make the \$100-million cut this year, that Hydro is somehow going to be able to do that and keep its promise that there will be no rate increase for 1994. Your first answer seems to suggest that there will be no layoffs to trigger the CUPE strike against Ontario Hydro. My question then is, by what alchemy, by what measure, by what magic, is Hydro going to achieve this \$100-million saving, particularly because you seem to be suggesting, parenthetically, that there may in fact be cuts, layoffs, in which case you will precipitate the CUPE strike?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No, no, no. The member is mixing two matters together. The first matter is that, as he knows, Ontario Hydro initiated, before the discussions around a social contract, a major restructuring and downsizing of the corporation. Those negotiations are ongoing between the bargaining agents and Ontario Hydro, and those will indeed, I suspect, involve considerable restructuring and changes at the corporation. I will not comment on those negotiations. All I'm saying is that I don't expect that the commitments Ontario Hydro has made with regard to the social contract will either precipitate further layoffs or in any way threaten the reliability and the commitments that Ontario Hydro has to provide electricity at cost to the people of Ontario.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question was for the Premier who, I now am told, is not coming to question period, so I will place the question to the Treasurer. The public has been, certainly in my experience, demanding a new way of doing politics. In that spirit, we put forward constructive amendments to your social contract legislation that ensure that our long-held principles of restraint could be both fair and workable. A week ago, in good faith, I talked with your Premier and I forwarded to your Premier and to your caucus a draft copy of our amendments.

To date, Treasurer, the Premier has not bothered, nor have you or anybody from your caucus, to call me to indicate any willingness to discuss these amendments either publicly or privately, formally or informally. Then, less than an hour into the formal discussion in the Legislature, your party moved a time allocation motion to limit any debate there as well.

Treasurer, we've tried to work for a constructive process on this legislation which we think is fair. I suggest to you that in not responding to our amend-

ments and in not responding in the Legislature and in cutting off debate, you are moving into this realm of narrow partisanship, no better than the Liberals are on this issue. This is the old politics that I thought we agreed we were trying to change.

Members, in two hours' time, will not have had an opportunity to debate our amendments. I hear you have six more amendments that aren't even introduced yet, and yet at 5:45—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mr Harris:** —you want everybody to vote on those amendments.

I would ask you today, Treasurer, since you will not discuss them formally or informally, will you indicate to us today which of our amendments you will support and which of our amendments you will not?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** The leader of the Conservative Party did indeed forward a package of amendments to us last week, just as we forwarded our amendments to his caucus. It was my anticipation that we would be moving through the bill amendment by amendment last Wednesday and subsequently on other days, but it became evident fairly early on in the process that we were getting nowhere in the clause-by-clause debate. We debated all day Wednesday and didn't get beyond the first amendment, the first section of the bill, despite the fact that the House leader had offered to extend an extra day's hearings, I believe, on the clause-by-clause stage of the bill. So I don't think it's fair to say that we, in unseemly haste, rushed in the time allocation motion. This is simply not the case.

All I can say to the leader of the third party is that I have looked at his amendments very carefully, and hopefully we'll be able to deal with them this afternoon.

**Mr Harris:** Mr Treasurer, let me be specific. One of our amendments calls for a 5% decrease in wages across the board, all public sector, effective on the anniversary date of their contracts. This amendment respects the anniversary dates; it ensures that the 5% will come out. But more importantly than that, it's fair and it encourages ongoing negotiations between public sector employers and employees by rewarding initiatives that result in greater efficiency in government. It's fair, it's effective over the long term, it eliminates any possibility of snapback at the end of the three-year period. Will you support that specific amendment this afternoon?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No. First of all, I'm not sure what the leader of the third party means by the anniversary of the contract.

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** Why didn't you ask three days ago, then? Why didn't you ask? You didn't even give a time. You weren't looking at it seriously.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for London North.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** All I was trying to convey to the leader of the third party before his seatmate lost her cool was that I didn't understand what he meant by the anniversary date, to what extent he meant the date of the expiry of the contract or an anniversary which would be one year hence. Since the social contract is a three-year contract and we must achieve—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Final supplementary.

**Mr Harris:** If you had read the amendment, it would have made it very clear that it's the anniversary, not the expiry of the contract; the anniversary date of the expiry of the contract. We've made that very clear. If you had read the amendment, if you had discussed it, if you were prepared to have debate, you would have known that.

You indicate that you won't support that one. Let me ask you about this: Many small municipalities, school boards and hospitals say it's virtually impossible to meet their targets under the existing bill without layoffs, because few, if any, of their staff make over \$30,000. To make this matter worse, your government now has an amendment that will amend the bill to exempt part-timers who, on an annual basis, make under \$30,000. So under this scenario, a \$500-a-day part-timer who works less than 60 days a year for the government will be untouched by your restraint efforts as long as he works for less than 60 days. Our amendment corrects that and changes that. Our amendment makes sure that won't take place. Can I ask you specifically—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Will the member for Nipissing please take his seat.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Will the leader of the third party place his question.

1420

**Mr Harris:** I ask you specifically, will you support our amendment that says those under \$30,000, and part-timers as well, will not be exempt from this legislation?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** One of the prime motivations of the bill was to protect people who are at relatively low income.

**Mr Harris:** No it wasn't. It was to cut the size and cost of government.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Of course it was, but while we're doing that, the leader of the third party would ask the people earning \$20,000, \$25,000 or \$29,000 per year to make a contribution to the problems we face in this province.

I acknowledge the fact that in order to protect people earning under \$30,000, there are going to be distortions along the lines to which the leader of the third party



makes reference. I acknowledge that, but I would put to him that the distortions or the unfairness of having people under \$30,000 make a contribution through a 5% reduction to their income is a much greater distortion than having a few people who, if you annualize their salaries, would earn over \$30,000 a year.

**Mr Harris:** At \$20,000, you hiked their taxes.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** And you want to do more. You want to take more—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** New question, the member for St Catharines.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** It sounds as though the leader of the third party is trying to wriggle off the hook and will be voting with us on third reading.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I want to ask this question to the Premier of the province. As the Premier is in his office and not here, I'll have to ask the Solicitor General, I guess.

In light of the fact that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations refuses to concede that there are some very genuine problems that will exist as you begin this extravaganza of casino gambling in this province, would you comment on the fact that organized crime is very much likely to move in a very big way in the province?

In fact, there's a quote from William Jahoda, who is a former mob overseer of gambling in Chicago, who said the following: "In a May 16, 1992, letter to the Chicago Crime Commission, Jahoda warned that converging on Chicago 'will be every pimp, burglar, drifter, car thief, booster, arsonist, counterfeiter, prostitute, dope dealer, con man, hijacker, extortionist and worse.'"

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. There's no more on your list?

**Mr Bradley:** I ask the minister, would he and his friend the Premier, who runs everything in that government, like to see an Ontario as described in this particular letter?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** I will refer the question to the minister responsible for the casino issue on behalf of the government.

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I'll be happy to answer the question from my friend from the opposition. Without any insult to anybody from the Star, I have to say that the Star story is a tired old rehash of clippings from the last decade. It has nothing to do with the reality of—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Churley:** I can see I'm in trouble now, but it's true. Had the Star bothered to talk to OPP Commissioner O'Grady or Windsor Police Chief Adkin, they

would have been told by them that the situation is well in hand. We have to remember that the OPP is responsible for the security at the casino and, unlike the opposition, the government has full confidence in the OPP.

I just want to read this to you; you'll want to hear this, I know: In an interview last week, Windsor Police Chief Adkin said that proper steps and planning concerning crime at the Windsor casino were already taking place and that it is already paying dividends. This work being done will stop criminal influence before it happens. That is a quote from the Windsor police chief.

**Mr Bradley:** Virtually everybody in any centre where there has been casino gambling, at the beginning, before it starts, has had the same line before the cards are dealt, but after the cards are dealt—I ask the minister, and I really wanted to direct this to the Premier or the Solicitor General: In light of the fact that under the social contract legislation there are bound to be cutbacks because of the less money that's going to be available to police forces, that there are bound to be cutbacks to police forces across this province, does she not understand that we're bound to see an increase in crime at the very same time that police forces are being cut back in their resources and their numbers? Does she not shudder at the thought of Robert Fuesel of the Chicago Crime Commission saying that the legalization of casino gambling would fuel a renaissance of organized crime at the very time that our police force resources and numbers will be diminished?

**Hon Ms Churley:** No, I'm not concerned about that statement because I don't accept that statement. The mob has been driven out of the large casino operations completely, and I have full confidence in the OPP and the police community, which we've been working with from the beginning.

I have lots of other quotes. We hear a lot of the negatives, perceived negatives, from the opposition, but there are all kinds of positives that have been talked about out there. For instance: "If you want to do it right, that's the way to do it....you have to go slow or things go wrong." This quote is from the US gambling industry analyst on the Ontario government's deliberate—some are saying too slow—efforts to create a tight regulatory system of regulations. That's just one quote of many. If only you had another supplementary, I'd give you others.

We are being noticed around the world, in a very complimentary way, in terms of how we brought the police in from the very beginning to set up a very tight regulatory and enforcement system. I'll be glad to share more information with the member about this later.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Early last month, there was a meeting in

Vancouver of the ministers of trade from across this country dealing with interprovincial trade barriers. There were only two provinces that were not represented at that meeting: One was Ontario and the other was Saskatchewan, two New Democratic Party governments.

Coming out of that meeting, Madam Minister, the province of British Columbia declared quite boldly that it was in favour of interprovincial trade barriers. Does your absence from that meeting, along with your other NDP colleague from Saskatchewan, and the attitude of the BC government reflect Ontario's attitude towards interprovincial trade barriers, and is that the reason that you are reluctant to take action on the present situation with construction workers crossing the border from Quebec into Ontario while Ontario workers do not have the same right to go back the other way? In other words, are you acting in good faith in terms of trying to resolve this problem or do you have a philosophical problem with resolving the problem we are now facing in eastern Ontario?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I don't have a philosophical problem with resolving the issues. I don't quite understand the member's question. He seemed to indicate that the BC position was in favour of trade barriers, and was that why I wouldn't deal with quick action against Quebec, which would be to erect trade barriers, which would suggest, then, that I was in favour of trade barriers. But what I've been saying is that we don't want to take unilateral steps unless we are forced, with no other choice. We would like to negotiate to bring trade barriers down.

I can say to the member that my absence at that meeting is of no import with respect to the position that we have taken. I had intended to go right up until that very morning. That day we had both a priorities and planning cabinet and caucus meeting with respect to Bill 48 and the legislation coming in, and I was asked by the Premier to say we sent officials. I called and made my position known to the chair. I had that passed on and have in fact been in touch with people subsequent to that. So I did miss the actual afternoon of the meeting but have continued to pursue the issue.

1430

**Mr Sterling:** Maybe the minister doesn't understand how important this issue is to the people of eastern Ontario, particularly the construction workers in eastern Ontario. When you drive through the subdivision in the city of Kanata, which I represent and which is fortunately building a few houses there, the street is littered with trucks from the province of Quebec, whereas the workers and the carpenters from Ontario do not have the same right to drive their trucks over to the province of Quebec.

This Legislature passed a resolution in April telling the government of Ontario to take retaliatory actions

equivalent to the province of Quebec. We now have people from the province of Quebec, the right to work group from the province of Quebec, saying, "Ontario, take retaliatory action against the politicians in our own province." In other words, it acts against their own interests. They see that this is so unjust.

Madam Minister, you can say, "We are having bilateral discussions." The Liberals had bilateral discussions. Our former government had bilateral discussions. They came to nothing. The only thing that has got Quebec off its seat with regard to being fair is what Frank McKenna has done in New Brunswick.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Sterling:** This Legislature has said, "Do the same thing here." That was given endorsement by the Conservatives, by the New Democratic Party members and some of the Liberals who sat in this Legislature at that time.

**The Speaker:** Would the member place a question.

**Mr Sterling:** Madam Minister, when are you going to take action?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I have answered questions to this member, to the member from the Liberal Party and on other occasions to other members in this House, and I have indicated that there is action being taken. I have spelled that out and I am going to spell that out one more time.

We have entered into negotiations with all the other provinces with respect to removal of trade barriers in provinces right across this country. Those negotiations are taking place as we speak. They are ongoing.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The date. Give us a date.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** There is a framework which has been signed that has time frames and dates in it. As the member opposite keeps nattering away about a date, let him pick up the document and look at it himself. The dates are there in terms of when we will be reporting back and when the negotiations will be concluded.

Part of entering into the negotiations was an agreement on the part of every province that we would not unilaterally erect new trade barriers during the course of negotiations. While you're at the table bargaining, you don't put new issues on the table that have to be negotiated away. We are trying to respect that. We have made it clear to Quebec that we need action quickly on several issues, and the construction issue is of prime importance to us.

In closing, let me say those meetings will take place bilaterally with Quebec, as well as the multilateral talks. If action is not achieved over the course of this summer, we will take action, we will take steps, we will support, as I've indicated to this member, the intent of the resolution that was passed by this House.



## RETAIL SALES TAX

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** My question is to the Minister of Finance. I received a phone call from a constituent this morning in response to an article that appeared in one of the Toronto media which made its way up to Timmins. The question was around the provincial sales tax that is being applied on the insured portions of the CMHC mortgages. What was being alleged in that article was that basically that would make it very difficult for people to be able to take advantage of that particular program by virtue of the cost. I'm wondering if you can give any assurances to that particular individual on that question.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I missed some of the question, but I'll attempt to answer it and he can pick up what I miss in a supplementary.

The tax on the insurance did in fact come down with the budget this year. The impact of the tax I do not believe is onerous. I was reading in one of the tabloids—I can't remember whether it was the National Enquirer or the Toronto Sun—a story which used the example of a \$200,000 home. The cost of the tax on the insurance on that \$200,000 home, I think, would be around \$380, as I recall, which I don't think is an onerous burden.

I know no one likes to pay more tax on anything. I appreciate that. But at the same time, I believe that the way in which the tax increases in this budget were designed to help us get our financial house in order was not an unfair application of the retail sales tax.

**Mr Bisson:** By way of supplementary, I just want to know what kind of notification, if any, was given in regard to moving on this particular initiative to home owners and buyers.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** That's a more difficult question to answer. It was announced in the budget, so there was notification in that sense. Then right after the budget there was a notification went out. Now, we don't know who the potential home buyers are, of course, but there was a notification went out to CMHC indicating that this was indeed the case. That's my understanding of what the old Ministry of Revenue sent out, and then the CMHC would notify home buyers as to what the tax was and how they would actually pay it.

But I would remind you that in the example I used, it's one fifth of 1%, so I don't think that's an onerous burden, although, as I said earlier, I could understand why people don't like to pay it. But I think that it's not an unfair tax.

## CONDUCT OF MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** My question is to the Minister of Citizenship. There was a recent article in a Toronto daily which discussed the dismissal of two members of the Minister of Citizenship's personal political staff for interfering in a case

before the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

There are a number of issues raised in this article that call for clarification. What specific instructions, I would like to know, did the minister give her political staff concerning contact with the Human Rights Commission, and can the minister provide this Legislature with a copy of these guidelines? I'll be rather interested to see that.

I know it is normal for members of the minister's political staff to contact the human rights officers about specific cases. What specific rule was it that these two members of the minister's personal political staff broke? What exactly was that transgression that merited their dismissal? The minister said that she did not ask for detail. Then what information did the minister have upon which to base her decision to dismiss these two members of her staff?

In conclusion, the article says that the minister found out about these matters after the member's personal political staff offered their resignations to the deputy minister. Why would the minister's personal staff submit their dismissal forms to the deputy minister?

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship):** In fact the member opposite has been very inclusive in his questions and I don't know if the Speaker will permit me to answer each and every one of them because usually we don't have enough time. But I think what I will do, first of all, is talk very clearly about this particular issue and say, as I've mentioned very often in the House, that political interference in specific cases that are before the Human Rights Commission is not tolerated. People know this in the House and we all respect that particular type of issue. The minister has a responsibility for the process of the commission, but the actual interfering in or inquiring into a particular case is not to be done, and we know that very clearly.

One of the questions that the member opposite asked was about what type of instruction I had personally given to the members of my staff. We have a written protocol. It's not just instructions, but there is a written protocol that very, very clearly outlines the procedures that are to happen if a case should come before the staff.

In fact, if I might say, this gives me the opportunity right now to say to everybody in the House that I often get letters, I get inquiries, I get calls from the member opposite who has asked this question about a specific case. I always have to write back—and I know, Mr Speaker, you're telling me to move on—but I always have to tell the person who has been inquiring about the case that we cannot inquire specifically about a particular case, nor should the minister know about an individual case.

1440

**Mr Curling:** I don't think that the minister has

answered my question at all. First, if I did call your office about a specific case, I would talk about the human rights, the delay and the long time it takes to process cases. I'm talking about procedure.

I ask you to share with us your guideline, and I also ask you, how is it you could make a decision about two members, when of course you did not hear the specific case? I would like to know specifically why those members of your personal political staff handed their resignation to the deputy minister and not to you.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** First of all, I'd like to clarify to the member opposite, there was a breach of a protocol, the written protocol, and to be specific and honest with the member opposite, the article that was written in the Toronto Star I think was very well done and very well documented. That particular area about where the members had left the employ of the ministry and that the resignations had been handed in to the deputy minister unfortunately was erroneous, but that is one small little detail that unfortunately happened in that particular article. The rest of the article I think was fairly clear.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** I have a question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Minister, over a month ago, this Legislature approved a plan of action for how to deal with the Quebec situation. We had NDP members, we had some Liberal members, we had all the Progressive Conservative members endorse a motion by the member for Carleton that called upon the government to follow the plan of action that was taken by the Premier of New Brunswick in dealing with Quebec.

Minister, because that motion asked you to do the same thing for Ontario on behalf of all Ontario workers, particularly those in eastern Ontario—and I might add, it goes all the way up northeastern Ontario as well—I ask you this: Do you have so little respect for the Legislature that you have chosen to use your executive position to overrule the vote and the will of the Legislature and to ignore what we told you to do in that motion that was passed right here in the Legislature of Ontario?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I have a lot more respect for this Legislature in terms of providing honest interpretation of events than some members in the Legislature.

Let me say very directly I've responded on this issue today a number of times and a number of times in the past. With respect to the resolution, I have indicated the resolution, which calls for us to take unilateral action to erect new trade barriers, would also be in violation of an agreement that the province of Ontario has entered into with all of the provinces and on which we are currently in negotiations.

**Mr Harris:** That is the direction you were given by the Legislature. That is what the Legislature asked you to do.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** If the leader of the third party would be quiet for a moment, I will try to answer his question.

Let me continue to say that with respect to the resolution, I have also indicated that we have requested and have agreement from the province of Quebec to enter into bilateral negotiations with respect to these very pressing issues. That meeting will be coming up very soon. If no action is forthcoming as a result of that meeting, then we will be looking very seriously at taking actions which would be retaliatory of nature. I can see that happening over the course of this summer and responding in fact to the intent of the resolution that was passed by this House.

**Mr Harris:** I listened very carefully. What the minister said was: "I don't like what the Legislature asked me to do. Therefore I'm not going to do it." That is exactly what you said. You said, "I and the cabinet and the Premier, and me, the minister, I have a different way of dealing with this." The Legislature directed you as to how you would deal with it, and you have chosen to flout the Legislature and say, "The heck with the will of the majority of the people of this province," and you're going to proceed in your own way in spite of what we told you.

Could I ask you this: The minister, in addition to flouting the Legislature, says—instead of attending a meeting because she was busy with something else and this issue wasn't as important as this other meeting and you couldn't reschedule any of your other meetings on Bill 48; they had to be right at that time.

Could the minister table with this Legislature the letter or the brief that she sent out to that ministers' meeting? We have not seen that, nobody knows what you have said and quite frankly I hereby challenge your commitment to dropping the interprovincial trade barriers, based upon the fact you wouldn't bring it up at the first ministers' meetings on the Constitution. You have never been serious about it. Will you today table that brief you sent out west so we can see how serious you are about interprovincial trade barriers?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** Is the member questioning that I don't want to get rid of interprovincial trade barriers or that I don't want to erect new ones with respect to Quebec? I don't think they know what they're arguing over there from the third party.

**Mr Harris:** We know exactly what we are arguing, and you got a clear direction from the Legislature and you chose to ignore it.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I have not said that I have no respect for a private member's resolution that was passed in this House during private members' hour. I



have said that with respect to that resolution—

**Mr Harris:** Oh, it's private members' hour so it doesn't count. Is that what it is? We are wasting our time every Thursday. Private members don't count. That's exactly the problem. Why do you schedule it if it doesn't count?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The leader of the third party, please come to order.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I hope the press gallery realizes that we really understood there wasn't an issue for today, so we're all working at trying to create one here.

I say to the member opposite that with respect to the process of negotiations, both multilaterally and bilaterally—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I say to the member, and I want to try to walk through this very briefly one more time, that we are in multilateral negotiations. We have, at that table, agreed not to erect any trade barriers. We have tabled positions and I have been at meetings and have argued the serious intent of Ontario to facilitate bringing down interprovincial trade barriers. Bilaterally with Quebec we are trying to address as a priority issue the issue of construction workers, and particularly as it affects eastern and northeastern Ontario.

If we are unable, over the course of the summer through negotiations, to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion, I will be prepared to recommend to my cabinet colleagues taking steps that are in keeping with the intent of the resolution that was passed.

That doesn't not respect the resolution—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** —but it does try to put that into the reality of a set of negotiations. May I say that the member who sponsored the resolution said very directly to me—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** —that he hoped it was a pressure tactic on Quebec to bring it to the table. The party there also recognizes—

**The Speaker:** Please take your seat. New question, the member for Durham Centre.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you for recognizing me today. I have a question for the Minister of Environment and Energy.

**Mr Harris:** The brief kind of hedged a bit didn't it? Why don't you table it? That was the question, dummy.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** Excuse me, Mr Speaker, sexist.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** The member for Durham Centre, please take his seat.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** You told us to shut up, but when you are called a dummy, it is sexist.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** You told him to shut up. What is that? What did you say to him?

**The Speaker:** I ask the members of the House to come to order, including the member for Oakville South, immediately.

I had recognized the honourable member for Durham Centre before all the racket and I will now allow the member for Durham Centre to place his question.

1450

#### UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** You have double standards, don't forget.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for York Mills will come to order immediately.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Mr Speaker, this is the second time within a week I have noticed behaviour from members of the opposition towards a female member of this cabinet which I would like you to take under consideration—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Etobicoke West will remain seated.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —because I don't believe they would use those words against a male member of this cabinet.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Why don't you talk out the real issue, that's the Quebec issue. You are supposed to be representing eastern Ontario in cabinet and you do nothing. What a bunch of crap.

**The Speaker:** The member for Leeds-Grenville should come to order.

To the member for Ottawa Centre, I acknowledge that the level of language in here often is not appropriate.

**Mr Turnbull:** The double standard.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** It's not a double standard.

**The Speaker:** The member for York Mills will come to order.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I think that the best a Speaker can do is to implore members to have respect for Parliament. If they choose not to show respect for Parliament, they will have to wrestle the question within themselves. This afternoon's display is not worthy of any member in this assembly. I would ask the members to allow the member for Durham Centre to place his

question so that we can complete question period.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would quite agree with the statements that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly has just made. I would also like to point out, with respect to the point of order from the member for Ottawa South, that I think there were inappropriate comments made on both sides of this Legislature and I would appreciate it if you would appreciate once in a while that there are two sides to this House.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Since you are dealing with the member for Ottawa Centre's comments about the behaviour of members of the Legislature, I thought I heard her say—I could be incorrect—"especially the male members of the opposition." I simply would like the Speaker to take into consideration the condescending attitude that I have seen by the Premier and certain members of the government side towards the leader of the official opposition over the past several months.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** We're not talking about condescension here. We're talking about terms in language.

**The Speaker:** Order. In case it wasn't absolutely clear to anyone, I was referring to the conduct of this chamber and not any member in particular. It rests with each one of the elected members here to ensure that we have appropriate decorum in this chamber.

#### WASTE DISPOSAL

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have a question for the Minister of Environment and Energy, and it frankly arises from some concern which a life-long friend of mine has written to me about.

This friend of mine lives in northeastern Ontario. He is a director of a number of environmental groups, as I have been in the past. Frankly, although he comes from northeastern Ontario, some of his concerns are the same as my own, and that is in regard to Bill 143, which as you know was the Interim Waste Authority bill.

My friend, whose name is Dr Richard Denton, speaks of concerns about his area as not being a willing host for Metro's garbage. He is concerned that Mr Harris has said that he would repeal Bill 143. My concern is that 143 stay in place and that Durham not have to deal with Metro's garbage any more than Kirkland Lake does.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** In response to my friend, Bill 143 has been passed by the Legislature. It is a statute of the province of Ontario. The government of Ontario is committed to that law. The IWA process will proceed according to its mandate, taking into account Bill 143 and government policy. I can only speak for this government. This government remains committed to Bill 143 and ensuring that there will be a full environmental assessment on any decisions made by the IWA in its search for proper sites for the garbage for the greater Toronto area.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want to bring to the attention of the House that the Minister of Health in Jamaica is in the Speaker's gallery and we could pay attention to that and recognize him.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I appreciate the member's point of order. Indeed, we had the opportunity to introduce the honourable member to the assembly earlier.

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The honourable minister mentioned that because Bill 143 was a statute of Ontario, therefore the government was committed to the law. The same was not true of the boundaries negotiations act in the case of London.

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of order. Petitions? The member for York Centre.

#### *Interjections.*

#### PETITIONS

##### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I have a petition signed by 133 residents of my community of York Centre and surrounding communities, including Rexdale and other areas, patients of a number of doctors in my community: Dr Patricia Waite, Dr Trudy McNabb and Dr John Dawson, who practises in the Richmond Hill area. The petition reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plans and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services across the province;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association-government framework and economic agreement."

As I said, sir, this petition is signed by 143 residents in my riding and I affix my signature to it as well.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition that's signed by many scores of people from Fergus. It reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has



not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I support this petition and have signed it.

#### SCARBOROUGH BLUFFS CONSERVATION

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** I have a petition signed by a number of Scarborough constituents and friends of the Scarborough environment.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Scarborough Bluffs are of a distinct nature, unique to the North American continent; and

"Erosion of the bluffs and loss of their face has been proceeding at an accelerating and alarming rate in the past year, particularly in the Sylvan Drive area; and

"Construction of a stabilizing lakefront road has already secured adjacent bluffs; and

"The lakefront road will be one component of the waterfront trail being developed by the waterfront trust,

"We, the undersigned, call upon the Minister of Natural Resources to make securing of the bluffs an immediate priority and to enable the Metro Toronto conservation authority to proceed with necessary construction."

I'm pleased to add my signature to this.

1500

#### GAMBLING

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party government has not consulted the citizens of the province regarding the expansion of gambling; and

"Whereas families are made more emotionally and economically vulnerable by the operation of various gaming and gambling ventures; and

"Whereas creditable academic studies have shown that state-operated gambling is nothing more than a

regressive tax on the poor; and

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has in the past vociferously opposed the raising of moneys for the state through gambling; and

"Whereas the government has not attempted to address the very serious concerns that have been raised by groups and individuals regarding the potential growth in crime;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government immediately cease all moves to establish gambling casinos and refrain from introducing video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario."

I've signed the petition.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provisions of quality health care services across the province;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

This is signed by hundreds of people from my constituency, and I also attach my signature.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a petition to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"That free and open collective bargaining for public service employees be restored and be returned to its honourable position in Ontario;

"That the social contract in its present form be destroyed and that the valuable programs and services in the public sector be maintained for the betterment of all Ontarians;

"That the government withdraw Bill 48 and, in place of this bill, that the government work cooperatively with the public service unions to find an equitable solution rather than eliminating valuable public services."

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The

member for Brant-Haldimand.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: A member when he submits a petition must sign it and indicate whether or not he supports the petition.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** There's no point of order; please take your seat. Please, there's too much noise in the House. I can't hear anything.

Petitions? The member for Mississauga North.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a petition to this assembly but also to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I had recognized the member for Brant-Haldimand; my apologies.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I'm always prepared to wait my turn.

The petition reads as follows:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

It's signed by 301 residents of my riding and adjoining areas, and I've affixed my signature in support.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

I have a petition signed by 131 residents of the province, mostly in the riding of Parry Sound.

"Whereas I believe in the need of keeping Sundays as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom, the elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families;

"Whereas the amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated;

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act."

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

**Mr Dennis Drainville (Victoria-Haliburton):** To

the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario from the people of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"That free speech and open collective bargaining for public service employees be restored and be returned to its honourable position in Ontario;

"That the social contract in its present form be destroyed and that the valuable programs and services in the public sector be maintained for the betterment of all Ontarians;

"That the government withdraw Bill 48 and, in place of this bill, that the government work cooperatively with the public service unions to find an equitable solution rather than eliminating valuable public services."

I'm glad to affix my signature with these many hundreds that are here.

#### GAMBLING

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I have a petition signed by 65 members of the Strathroy United Church, who petition the government of Ontario to "cease all moves to establish gambling casinos."

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I have a petition signed by numerous people from the Ottawa-Carleton area, and I appreciate that I have the opportunity to present this petition before the House recesses. The petition reads as follows:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to Bill 38, which will eliminate Sunday from the definition of 'legal holiday' in the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for family time, quality of life and religious freedom. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38 to delete all Sundays except Easter from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

I have affixed my name and have voted against this bill on second reading.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"Whereas proposals made under government's expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of health care; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality health care services



across the province;

"We the undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw these proposed measures and reaffirm its commitment to rational reform of Ontario's health care system through its obligations under the 1991 Ontario Medical Association/government framework and economic agreement."

I've signed my name to this petition. It is from 125 concerned citizens of London and other parts of south-western Ontario.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** I am herewith presenting a petition signed by 546 people who are in opposition to Bill 38, which legalizes wide-open Sunday shopping. I have affixed my signature to this petition.

#### DAY CARE

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly, and primarily to the Minister of Community and Social Services. It reads:

"As a result of Bob Rae's expenditure control plan, the region of Peel has proposed to discontinue the family day care program. This will affect 932 children, ages six weeks to 10 years, in the region of Peel.

"Family day care is provided for working lower-income families, as well as working single parents. These cuts will leave all 932 children without safe, regulated day care.

"We as a community could be faced with higher taxes. How? Not only will the providers be added to our current unemployment lists, but parents may be forced to quit work because they cannot afford the high cost of day care. The result: increased usage of the welfare and mother's allowance system."

This has been signed by hundreds of concerned people: providers and people who require the use of this system in the region of Peel. It is to this Legislative Assembly and particularly the Minister of Community and Social Services, and I am pleased to affix my signature to this petition.

#### RETAIL STORE HOURS

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition from constituents in my riding of Dufferin-Peel:

"I, the undersigned, hereby register my opposition in the strongest of terms to the proposed amendment of the Retail Business Holidays Act.

"I believe in the need of keeping Sunday as a holiday for quality of life, religious freedom and family time. The elimination of such a day will be detrimental to the fabric of society in Ontario and cause increased hardship on many families.

"The amendment included in Bill 38, dated June 3, 1992, to delete all Sundays except Easter (51 per year) from the definition of 'legal holiday' and reclassify them as working days should be defeated."

I've signed this petition.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** I have a petition from about 30 people in my riding, different parts of the riding, opposed to casino gambling and the introduction of video lottery terminals.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"Whereas proposals made under the government's expenditure control plan and social contract initiatives regarding health care in the province of Ontario will have a devastating impact on access to and the delivery of psychotherapy; and

"Whereas these proposals will enable government to unilaterally and arbitrarily restrict payments for psychotherapy; and

"Whereas these proposals will result in a severe reduction in the provision of quality mental health care services across the province;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario move immediately to withdraw the proposal to restrict payments for psychotherapy and withdraw the proposal to allow the cabinet to make decisions with respect to the number of times patients may receive particular insured services and set maximums with respect thereto. The government of Ontario must reaffirm its commitment to the process of joint management and rational reform of the delivery of medical services in the province as specified under the OMA/government framework agreement."

I've affixed my name to this petition and agree with it.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### RECALL ELECTION REQUEST ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 SUR LE DÉCLENCHEMENT D'ÉLECTIONS PAR PÉTITION

On motion by Mr McClelland, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 59, An Act to provide for Petitions requiring the Premier to request the Calling of an Election / Loi exigeant que le premier ministre, sur pétition, demande que soit tenue une élection.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you have any comments?

**Mr Carman McClelland (Brampton North):** Very briefly, the bill requires the Premier to request that the Lieutenant Governor call a general election if a petition

asking the Premier to make such a request is filed with the Speaker. The petition must meet certain requirements, including requirements that it not have been signed within the first year following the most recent general election and that the number of persons who sign be at least equal to two thirds of the number of persons who voted in that election.

It's my belief that there's a general sentiment and a mood and certainly a willingness now for people to look at some very fundamental and significant parliamentary reform. Therein lies the intent and the genesis of this particular bill.

ELECTION AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993

MODIFIANT LA LOI ÉLECTORALE

On motion by Mr David Johnson, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 60, An Act to amend the Election Act / Loi modifiant la Loi électorale.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** This bill will extend the proxy voting rights to elderly persons, disabled persons and persons away for personal reasons. The bill will also extend the time limit for an application to vote by proxy by allowing the person appointed as a proxy voter to present the application to vote by proxy on polling day.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'IMPOSITION DES CORPORATIONS

On motion by Mr Laughren, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 66, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act /

Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'imposition des corporations.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** This bill will put into effect the proposals contained in the Ontario budget of April 30, 1992. The bill will also provide legislative support for a number of administrative initiatives announced in the 1993 budget and make certain technical amendments to bring the Corporations Tax Act in line with the federal Income Tax Act.

As announced in 1992, the small business income tax rate will be reduced from 10% to 9.5%, and the income tax rate for manufacturing and processing, mining, farming, logging and fishing will be reduced from 14.5% to 13.5%. This bill will impose a temporary income tax surtax of 10% on banks for the period from May 1992 to October 1993 and increase the capital tax paid by banks from 1% to 1.12%.

This bill will also simplify corporate tax instalment requirements by bringing them more in line with those of the federal government and certain other provinces. Changes will also be made to enable the charging of proper amounts of interest for delinquent instalments.

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if we could ask the Treasurer to further elaborate on the bill that he has just introduced. It is relating to a budget of two years ago, and he has given no indications of the retroactivity provisions of the bill and other significant impacts that it will have.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** That's no point of order.

*Report continues in volume B.*











# CONTENTS

Tuesday 6 July 1993

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Jury duty</b>	
Mr Callahan	2197
<b>Municipal government</b>	
Mr David Johnson	2197
<b>Niagara Guardian</b>	
Ms Haeck	2197
<b>Senior citizens</b>	
Mrs O'Neill	2198
<b>Government legislation</b>	
Mr Jim Wilson	2198
<b>Festival of Lights</b>	
Ms Carter	2198
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mrs Caplan	2198
<b>Eric Nystedt</b>	
Mr Runciman	2199
<b>Children of divorce</b>	
Mr Hansen	2199

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Gambling</b>	
Mr Eves	2200
Ms Churley	2200, 2205
Mr Bradley	2205
<b>Interprovincial trade</b>	
Mr Conway	2201
Ms Lankin	2201, 2206, 2208
Mr Sterling	2206
Mr Harris	2208

<b>Ontario Hydro</b>	
Mr Conway	2203
Mr Wildman	2203
<b>Social contract</b>	
Mr Harris	2203
Mr Laughren	2204
<b>Retail sales tax</b>	
Mr Bisson	2207
Mr Laughren	2207
<b>Conduct of ministerial staff</b>	
Mr Curling	2207
Ms Ziemba	2207
<b>Waste disposal</b>	
Mr White	2210
Mr Wildman	2210

## PETITIONS

<b>Health care</b>	
Mr Sorbara	2210
Mr Turnbull	2211
Mrs Cunningham	2213
Mrs Sullivan	2213

<b>Gambling</b>	
Mr Arnott	2211
Mrs Fawcett	2211
Mrs Mathysen	2212
Mr Sutherland	2213

<b>Scarborough Bluffs conservation</b>	
Mr Frankford	2211

<b>Public service employees</b>	
Mr Abel	2211
Mr Drainville	2212
<b>Retail store hours</b>	
Mr Eddy	2212
Mr Eves	2212
Mr Daigeler	2212
Ms Haeck	2213
Mr Tilson	2213
<b>Day care</b>	
Mr Offer	2213

## FIRST READINGS

<b>Recall Election Request Act, 1993,</b>	
Bill 59	
Mr McClelland	2213
<b>Election Amendment Act, 1993,</b>	
Bill 60	
Mr David Johnson	2214
<b>Corporations Tax Amendment Act,</b>	
<b>1993, Bill 66</b>	
Mr Laughren	2214

## OTHER BUSINESS

<b>Visitors</b>	
The Speaker	2199
Mr Curling	2210
<b>Unparliamentary language</b>	
Ms Gigantes	2209
Mr Eves	2210
Mr Bradley	2210

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 6 juillet 1993

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

<b>Loi de 1993 sur le déclenchement</b>	
<b>d'élections par pétition,</b>	
projet de loi 59	
M. McClelland	2213
<b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi</b>	
<b>électorale, projet de loi 60</b>	
M. David Johnson	2214
<b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur</b>	
<b>l'imposition des corporations,</b>	
projet de loi 66	
M. Laughren	2214



CH 201  
X1  
-023  
No. 43B



N° 43B

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 6 July 1993

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 6 juillet 1993

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Sent as part of the television signal on the Ontario parliamentary channel, they are received by a special decoder and converted into data that your PC can store. Using any DOS-based word processing program, you can retrieve the documents and search, print or save them. By using specific fonts and point sizes, you can replicate the formally printed version. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Lists of members**

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Ces documents, télédiffusés par la Chaîne parlementaire de l'Ontario, sont captés par un décodeur particulier et convertis en données que votre ordinateur pourra stocker. En vous servant de n'importe quel logiciel de traitement de texte basé sur le système d'exploitation à disque (DOS), vous pourrez récupérer les documents et y faire une recherche de mots, les imprimer ou les sauvegarder. L'utilisation de fontes et points de caractères convenables vous permettra reproduire la version imprimée officielle. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

### **Listes des député(e)s**

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et dans le numéro du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions inscrites dans un ordre alphabétique et comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.



Tuesday 6 July 1993

*Report continued from volume A.*

1520

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

House in committee of the whole.

SOCIAL CONTRACT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 SUR LE CONTRAT SOCIAL

Consideration of Bill 48, An Act to encourage negotiated settlements in the public sector to preserve jobs and services while managing reductions in expenditures and to provide for certain matters related to the Government's expenditure reduction program / Loi visant à favoriser la négociation d'accords dans le secteur public de façon à protéger les emplois et les services tout en réduisant les dépenses et traitant de certaines questions relatives au programme de réduction des dépenses du gouvernement.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I just want to notify members that on my immediate right is senior legal counsel for Management Board secretariat, Mr Graham Stoodley, who is the director of legal services for the Ministry of Finance, to assist me this afternoon.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: We're dealing with a very complicated piece of legislation. There are a number of amendments I understand the government has that we haven't even seen yet. I don't know how much time we're going to have to deal with amendments, and I see that the government has professional expertise that you've allowed to sit with them. I wonder if the opposition parties could be afforded the same courtesy.

**The Chair (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The answer is no.

**Mr Harris:** Could we have unanimous consent then, Mr Chairman, that we could have the same privilege accorded the government? Otherwise, I withdraw my unanimous consent.

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous consent? No. There is no unanimous consent.

**Mr Harris:** Mr Chair, then I withdraw our party's unanimous consent for the government to have their expertise with them as well.

**The Chair:** We don't need unanimous consent. It's not required for them. They automatically have advisers.

**Mr Harris:** And we can't?

**The Chair:** And you can't.

**Mr Harris:** And we can't have unanimous consent?

**The Chair:** That's correct.

**Mr Harris:** Is that sexist too?

**The Chair:** Order, please. Are there any questions or comments to section 1?

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** If I might ask you a question, Mr Chairman, have we now received all the amendments that we're going to receive from the government?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** My understanding is that a complete package was sent across to the two opposition parties.

**The Chair:** Have you received them yet?

**Mr Phillips:** We've not received those amendments. I suppose the staff may have them. Have we received from the third party their amendments, Mr Chairman?

*Interjection.*

**Mr Phillips:** I'm asking the Chair.

**Mr Harris:** Perhaps I can assist the Chair, even though I'm not allowed, as the government is, to have staff here to assist in this very complicated matter. I know you have some of the amendments. I believe there are a few others that our critic will be bringing forward. To the best of my knowledge, because I can't have staff here to help me as the government can, I have not got all the amendments from the government.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** My understanding was that previously the amendments that were tabled last week were already sent over and that the third party had those, and that this afternoon several additional amendments were sent across to the opposition. That's my understanding.

**Mr Harris:** Well, I'm sorry, I don't have them. Maybe I do, but I can't leave right now to—

**The Chair:** The member for Scarborough-Agincourt, you didn't receive any?

**Mr Phillips:** I have not, but I understand our staff have just received them and are copying them now. But I wonder if we mightn't receive copies from the government and perhaps—

**The Chair:** We'll try to sort it out in a few minutes. We will wait until you get your package.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Mr Chairman, it was sent over to the House leader's executive assistant in each case, but I have an extra set of the new amendments. They already have the previous ones. I'd be happy to send the new amendments over right now, if that would be helpful.

**The Chair:** I'd like to read the following again:

"All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the Assembly by 4 pm on the sessional day on which the bill is considered in committee of the whole House following passage of this motion. Any divisions required during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House shall be deferred until 5:45 pm on that sessional

day. At 5:45 pm on such sessional day, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Any divisions required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put, the members called in once and all deferred divisions taken in succession."

Are there any questions or amendments to section 1?

**Mr Harris:** I move that section 1 be deleted.

**The Chair:** Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I assume that we are now debating section 1. The leader of the third party has moved that section 1 of the bill be deleted. The leader of the third party has moved from playing a role in which he was attempting to make amendments to a role now in which he would delete the section of the bill that lays out the purpose of the bill or the act, as it will eventually be called. I don't understand why he would do that, but it certainly makes no sense to delete a section of the bill that lays out its purpose.

**Mr Harris:** I withdraw it.

**The Chair:** We're debating section 1.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The rationale, I think, that the leader has is twofold.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** He just withdrew it.

**Mr Stockwell:** I heard him. I think the point he's trying to make on deleting section 1 was this: I suppose some staff have received copies of the amendments that this government has just drafted. We don't have copies of those amendments. We don't even know what portions of this piece of legislation they're applicable to. We have been denied the right to have staff sit on the floor so they may advise us because they're the only ones who have seen your amendments.

All we're doing is making the point—I think it's been well made—that this government has not supplied us with the amendments it just dreamt up yesterday, and we haven't read them. We've been denied the right to have staff sit here to advise us, who have had at least maybe 10 minutes to read them. I think the point was well made. If the Treasurer doesn't understand it, then I accept that.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I won't get into the argument ad hominem of the member for Etobicoke West and cast slurs and insults at him personally the way he does across to this side.

I would simply say to you that there were roughly 25 amendments—I actually didn't count them, but I think about 25 amendments—that were tabled last week for

which there was ample time for the opposition to examine them. Today there were, I believe, eight new amendments tabled, and the purpose of going through clause by clause is to look at each amendment by itself and debate it. If the opposition doesn't feel that it can do that, I don't understand it. It's a long tradition in this House that this is exactly what we do in committee of the whole.

**Mr Phillips:** I just want to respond to the Minister of Finance and say two or three things. One is that in the House earlier today, you indicated to the House that the reason you had moved closure was because the debate was going nowhere.

I will say to you very, very, very directly, the debate started at 3:30 in the afternoon and at 4 o'clock our House leader's office got your closure motion. The debate had gone on for half an hour, so you cannot use that argument, and it does you no service to be using that argument, to say that the debate was going nowhere. It was within half an hour of the debate starting, and the Hansard will show that. So I resent deeply you suggesting that, and I would suggest you not use that again.

Secondly, I would say to the House and to the public, this is the most important bill this House will debate in five years. There is no doubt about that, no doubt, and now we find, five minutes before we begin the final three hours of clause-by-clause debate, the minister has given us another, I gather, five or six amendments.

**Mr Stockwell:** Eight amendments.

**Mr Phillips:** Eight amendments. I will just say that this bill will impact one out of five workers in this province, it will impact the budget dramatically, it will impact 9,000 collective agreements, and I think the government has a lot of nerve to lay on the table eight amendments.

Some of them may be major. We don't know, because we got them five minutes ago, and then to suggest that the opposition somehow or other doesn't deserve a debate on this, as I said before, does you no service, Minister, and to suggest that we were filibustering when you decided after one half-hour of debate—one half-hour of debate in this House—to impose the closure motion, simply is inconsistent with what I'd hope would be a sensible, logical debate on a very important bill.

1530

We will get on with this bill, but now we've got less than three hours to debate it. We now have another eight amendments; 25 amendments that in my opinion demonstrate this bill was hastily drafted, is unworkable and is a huge mistake, and time will prove us right on that. Time will prove us right on that but you've got the guns to our heads. You will have your way and you will have this bill passed into law tomorrow, but I will say



to you, to give us eight more amendments five minutes before we begin the last three hours of debate is wrong, wrong, wrong.

**Mr Stockwell:** I would just like to respond quickly to the Treasurer. I don't often stand and call him to order on a couple of points, but I will this time.

Sir, I don't know who I slurred, and if I slurred anyone, it's withdrawn. I only suggested that we hadn't received copies of these amendments. It was frustrating and very difficult to deal with a bill as complicated as this. If I slurred anyone, I apologize. All I requested was that we have our staff here and we be given time to read these amendments and deal with them. Again, if it slurred anyone at all, I certainly withdraw it, but I'm not certain who I slurred.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The member is well taken in his point and I probably did exaggerate in my language in my references to what he'd said, and I withdraw what I said as well.

The member for Scarborough-Agincourt, however, talked about inadequate time and how there wasn't time to debate a very important bill. I would just say to him that last week he made reference to the time allocation motion being tabled, which indicated that there would be debate the rest of that day, all of the time allocation motion yesterday, and the bill again for the rest of today.

Despite the notification that there was restricted debate on time, the opposition chose to spend the rest of that afternoon not moving off section 1. We're still on section 1, despite the notification that there was going to be restricted time allowed for debate. At this point in time, when a whole day was spent not debating—

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** You moved it within half an hour.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The rest of the day wasn't spent moving through the bill; it was spent on not even moving off section 1. If you were that concerned about getting through the bill and having adequate time to debate, tell me why you spent all last Wednesday debating section 1.

**The Chair:** Order, just for a minute. I want to make a point here. We have serious matters ahead of us to debate amendments and the clock is ticking. If you don't want to start, that's your affair, that's your business. We'll continue on. I will recognize members but I just want to remind you that there are amendments to be debated.

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I note that in the package of new amendments which the Treasurer has put before the House there is included at least one amendment which affects previous amendments that the government had put, particularly with respect to the impact on school boards, many of which are facing bankruptcy or other extremely severe impacts as a result

of the amendments which were placed last week.

There has been no time to analyse the impact of these particular amendments which have been placed. As the debate started, the amendments were received by members here, and in every single school board area in the province, public and separate, the impacts are yet to be analysed or even known about.

I think it's unconscionable that the Treasurer has come forward without the kind of consultative process that would be available to the opposition members as well as to government with respect to the difficulties its previous amendments had put. I think this is an outrageous abuse of the parliamentary process and of this Legislature.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I guess what we really want to do is proceed through the bill, as painful as it is. I do apologize. I was downstairs looking at the announcement by OPSEU. In fact, the government has made some inroads there. OPSEU has announced that in spite of the legislation, it's going to be supporting it.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Small sector.

**Mr Cousens:** Small sector.

What I wanted to do is, if we could, deal with section 1 of the bill and then deal with the amendments before you. I don't think there's any doubt that we don't like having a gun to our heads and no time to deal with it, and somewhat of a reasonable time, if the time is going to be half an hour for every amendment, and then you could work through it and every point of view could be expressed. The Supreme Court can deal with big issues in 15 minutes and they're over and done with.

I feel there's been sufficient discussion and that we could deal with section 1. The government has an amendment on section 2. Our first amendment is on section 7 of the bill. Certainly, the intent from our caucus, and I'm speaking on behalf of them because no one else has seen your amendment, but I don't think it's going to change the world. I would be able to support your amendment to section 2, where you're clearly defining what the sectoral framework's all about, so that we get one of them out of the way and get on to some of the other ones that are before the House.

We've got a chance right now to make some constructive change to a bill that we feel is flawed; I have every hope that we have a chance through dialogue and discussion on the specific amendments. My colleagues in the House are extremely interested in how these amendments can impact certain health care units and certain municipalities and school boards, so then we can proceed with those specifically.

I understand how there are others who may not want to deal with amendments. I am here today to try to get as many amendments discussed, debated, considered, and through the dialogue we have, moved forward. As

limited as the time is, I'm saying, in an effort to show that intent, that we will be supporting the first amendment the government has. If we could then have a vote on sections 1 and 2, then we can proceed hopefully more quickly to some of the other amendments that are before us.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Since the member for Markham made reference to an agreement that had been signed, I wonder if the members would allow me to bring him up to date on what has happened today, if there's no disagreement.

The following development: At the community services table, which was one of the eight sectors that's been set up for sectoral bargaining, both employers and employees have signed a document which has been recommended to me for designation as a sectoral framework agreement. There are some 7,000 agencies in this sector, involving over 100,000 full- and part-time employees providing crucial services to the most vulnerable groups and individuals in our society.

At the municipal table, an agreement has been signed by the government and one of the major unions, and now is going through the process of approval by other participants, including the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, AMO.

Similarly, at the police subsectoral table, the police associations and the government have signed an agreement which awaits approval by the police services boards.

As social contract negotiations continue at other tables, I want to thank all the participants, public sector employers and employees, for working hard for the people of this province through a new and inevitably difficult process, and I want to express the hope that those still in talks will achieve similar success.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I was wondering, Mr Chairman, if I could just comment briefly on the Minister of Finance's statement. I was able to watch the press conference and I think the Treasurer would have to admit that, yes, there's been agreement in the community services sector, but "one of the easier sectors to which agreement is possible" is exactly what the presenters at the press conference said, because a number of the employees, particularly the Ontario Association for Community Living, spoke up and said, "A number of our employees are below the \$30,000 mark, therefore we didn't have to get into slashing wages," which is a point obviously germane to this legislation.

**Interjection:** Slashing?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Cutting wages then.

They're able to bring some efficiencies to the sector and that's how they're going to achieve their savings.

The Treasurer also didn't point out that the Service Employees' International Union, at the same press conference, indicated that it has five other tables it sits

at and it very clearly said at the press conference that it will be withdrawing from the social contract talks. Perhaps the Treasurer would like to comment on that.

1540

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I suppose it's whether you wish to describe your glass as being half full or half empty. I would simply say that I was pleased with the events of today.

This is a very difficult process, I think everyone would acknowledge, and it's not easy for the parties at the table to come to an agreement.

The reason I believe it's in everyone's best interests to do so, though, is to achieve the lower reduction targets that are available when a sectoral agreement is signed so that local agreements can then be signed and get access to the job security fund and redeployment and so forth and avoid the fail-safe mechanism that's contained in this bill.

I acknowledge the fact that there's a long way to go yet. I hope I didn't put too optimistic a spin on my comments. I tried to be rather just simply factual about it. I hope very much that the other sectors will come together and sign agreements as well, but I acknowledge that it's an extremely difficult process and that we've got a long way to go yet. So I wasn't implying that because this has happened today, it's clear sailing from now on. That's not what I was trying to convey to members opposite.

**Mr Cousens:** Shall section 1 carry, and then we can deal with the amendment? Is that what we're really trying to do here, systematically go through—

**The Chair:** Thank you. Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Shall the motion carry?

**Mr Phillips:** Is there an intent, Mr Chairman, that we will be stacking these votes? Is there an agreement on that?

**The Chair:** You need five persons to stand up. The motion is carried, therefore. We'll now deal with section 2.

**Mr Phillips:** No, I was standing for a vote.

**The Chair:** You need five people.

**Mr Phillips:** I understand that.

**The Chair:** There are not five people, so the vote is carried. We'll now deal with section 2.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I move that the definition of "sectoral framework" in section 2 of the bill be amended by striking out "section 11" in the second line and substituting "section 11 or 33.2."

If the members would like a short explanation, it



might be helpful to the debate. I know it's asking members to jump ahead, and I apologize for that, but if they were to cast their eyes ahead to the new amendment, section 33.2—and I really, I think, would be ruled out of order if I got into a debate on it now, but it deals with the designation of sectoral agreements after August 1, so this simply makes sure that the definition of “sectoral framework” doesn't apply only to the earlier part of the bill, section 11, but also to the later part, 33.2.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I was just wondering if we could have a copy of that amendment the Treasurer just put forward, because I understand it's a new amendment and many of the members on this side of the House simply don't have a copy of it.

**The Chair:** It is my understanding that copies were distributed.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** We're going ahead with an amendment that we were given a very few copies of from the government. I wonder if they have any extra copies, Mr Chairman, because our photocopier can't keep up with the pace of the new amendments coming in from the government.

**The Chair:** The Treasurer is taking the means now to get you some copies; if you want to patiently wait, he will get you copies.

**Mr Charles Beer (York North):** Mr Chair, on the same point: Just to note that the additional reference the Treasurer made to section 2, definition of “sectoral framework,” is about four pages long, so in addition to getting it, can we just have a moment to be able to read it?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I would be glad to be helpful. I don't want to presume for a minute how members opposite wish to engage in the debate this afternoon. I would hope we'd get to section 33.2. That's not my decision, but I would hope we'd get there because it is a fairly substantial amendment. What we're doing here now is voting on an amendment which allows 33.2 to cover the definition of “sectoral agreement” as well.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Mr Chairman, briefly, through you to the Treasurer: We're not stalling, Treasurer. We simply want to know what we're voting on as we go through each clause.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** Perhaps while we're waiting for those amendments, Mr Minister, looking at the definition of “public sector” on page 4 of section 2, the question arises, does “public sector” include the local hydro utilities? If so, the hydro utilities are saying they shouldn't be included, first of all. Second, if they are included, any cuts they make—as there's no transfers in money to the local hydro commissions from the province of Ontario, they're saying the money they have to pay to the province of Ontario should be put towards paying down the debt of Ontario

Hydro and the money should not go to the province of Ontario.

I wonder if you would comment on, first, are local hydro commissions included under “public sector” in section 2? Second, if you're insisting on extracting money from the local hydro commissions even though they receive no money from the province of Ontario, will you allow the cuts to go towards paying down the debt of Ontario Hydro, as the Municipal Electric Association has requested?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Yes, they are under the public sector, to answer directly the member for Don Mills.

Secondly, I would ask him to keep in mind that this comes up in several areas, such as Ontario Hydro, the Workers' Compensation Board, some of the agencies that are somewhat at arm's length from the government and so forth. The fact is that it's because of the social contract that compensation will be reduced, so for that reason, the savings are not being allowed to be simply subsumed within those agencies, whether it's for debt reduction or whether it's for building something new. That's the reason it's being done the way it is.

**Mr Phillips:** The member for East York raised it, and I think one of our members raised this question the other day. Does the public sector include private sector companies that may be involved in waste disposal, waste removal and in busing? The reason I ask this is because the Premier indicated in the House that it was not the intent of the bill to capture any private sector company that may be supplying, for example, garbage pickup in a municipality. But under the schedule in the back, under Municipal Affairs, there's an indication of “collection, removal and disposal of garbage and other refuse for a municipality.”

Maybe the minister could clarify that, because I don't think we got that clarification the other day.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think that's correct; we didn't get the clarification the other day. It is our intention to remove that by regulation.

**Mr Cousens:** As I look at what you've done, and it does take a minute to go back to 33 and understand the new section as it ties in, you've really tried to have the definition cover both the sectors before August 1 and after August 1; in fact, you're not really changing the sectors thereafter. It's a matter of just saying the agreements of the bill will then apply to both, but as defined under the two sections.

1550

I don't see any massive problem with that. It's what you're going to do afterwards that's causes us to worry. If we can get to those amendments, we'll deal with the authority that you're trying to bring upon yourself. We're going to change your name, instead of being Happy Floyd or Pink Floyd or Pink-Slip Floyd, to King Floyd. If we can get some of these amendments

through, we'll at least be able to have the prince brought down a little bit.

I don't see any massive concern on this, although I think the concerns being raised by the member for Don Mills and others have to do with the way in which all sectors are being treated equally, and that's an important aspect to it.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think the member is correct in that this is not a major amendment. It's just because of a subsequent amendment that this is required to be done.

**The Chair:** Any further questions or comments on the amendment to section 2? Are we ready for the question?

Mr Laughren has moved that the definition of "sectoral framework" in section 2 of the bill be amended by striking out "section 11" in the second line and substituting "section 11 or 33.2."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This question will be stacked.

Any further amendment to section 2?

We now have a motion on section 5.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Have we done 3 and 4?

**The Chair:** Just a minute, please. Shall sections 3 and 4 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

**Mr Jim Wilson:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I don't think we've had the vote on section 2 yet.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** On a point of order, Mr Chair: We haven't done section 2. We've only done the amendment on section 2.

**The Chair:** Could I have just a few minutes, please.

Because there is an amendment to section 2, you're right; your point of order is right on.

We will stack it and will vote on the amendment, and after that on the section itself.

Shall sections 3 and 4 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This is also stacked.

We'll now deal with section 5; an amendment to section 5.

Mr Laughren moves that section 5 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections:

"Limitation:

"(3) The minister shall not designate an organization as a bargaining agent under subsection (1) for

employees who are represented by a bargaining agent.

"Bargaining rights

"(4) A bargaining agent designated under subsection (1) has the right to bargain on behalf of the employees for the purposes of this act."

Are there any questions or comments?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** An explanation might be helpful, Mr Chairman. The way the bill read was a little disconcerting, because what we wanted to do was make sure that although the minister has the power to designate a bargaining agent, we wanted to make it absolutely clear that this would not be an attempt to go around an existing legitimate bargaining agent for the employees. In some cases there is no bargaining agent for the employees, and this would allow the minister to designate a bargaining agent for the employees. The new subsection (4) would clarify that the designated bargaining agents—the new ones where there are no other ones already there—have the bargaining rights to carry out under this act. An example would be an employee association where there's no traditional bargaining agent.

**Mr Phillips:** I'm just trying to get some idea of what we're buying here, because in theory this gives the minister the power to unilaterally determine who the bargaining agent is for all non-organized groups. That's an enormous power. That's how I read the bill: "The minister may recognize as a bargaining agent...." How will the minister determine what bargaining agent you're going to recognize? Will the employees be required to vote on the bargaining agent, or exactly what process will you follow here?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** So far it hasn't been a problem. An example would be management employees in the Ontario public service, where they have an organization that requested standing at the table for negotiating purposes, and we recognize that and take it very seriously; it's legitimate.

I would remind you as well that this relates only to this act. It does not relate to any other acts, so no one should think that it transfers to me or the minister of the day enormous powers in terms of recognizing who the bargaining agents are for any other purposes. It's strictly for the purposes of this act.

**Mr Cousens:** I don't have any problem with this particular amendment, although it begins to set a precedent we really have to be careful about. Having started down this road of the social contract, one had greater hopes that there'd be accommodation more quickly arrived at by all parties. Inasmuch as it isn't there, it means now that when the government has to legislate every step along the way, it then has to assume rights and powers that heretofore have been established in other codes and acts, such as the Labour Relations Act and so on. Now the government has to take an extra



presumption in order to deal with the social contract law.

Once you start breaking into those rules and guidelines—and for the New Democrats to do it is to take a special sense of zeal—you should be very, very cautious when you're in the process of making the kinds of decisions you're making here. I think it has to be exercised with tremendous caution. For the government to be doing this, it's all the more surprising that it's Bob Rae's government that's doing it.

Notwithstanding that, if the social contract is going to work, then you're going to have to have that authority along the way to establish certain bargaining agents, so as painful as it is, I'm prepared to see this amendment go ahead.

We're going to have to make sure along the way that we put some control on the honourable Minister of Finance, who may not always be as honourable as he can smile away in the House. There are other times when he's in there, under the influence of Ms Lankin and others, that he might be inclined to do things that aren't just as good-natured.

Having said that, we would generally support the intent.

**Mr Murphy:** I am delighted to hear that the Treasurer has said it's to apply only "for the purposes of this act," although I don't think the amendments do that. I know those words are in there, but frankly, if you wanted to make sure that was the case, I'd add the word "only," because I don't think it says that on its face. It says "for the purposes of this act," but it's not exclusively to those purposes. I think it could be read as saying "for those purposes," and doesn't say that other purposes are not permitted. I think that the addition of the word "only" is some limit on that power.

I'm concerned with this provision in general. I think it does provide the minister quite a substantial authority that is unfettered, in his or her opinion.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** You're not a lawyer, are you?

**Mr Murphy:** No, I just play one on TV.

Subsection 5(2) is an odd sort of section. In other words, 5(1) gives the minister all the discretion to decide what organizations to recognize. Subsection (2), in theory, provides limitations, but those limitations are what the minister thinks the limitations should be. It's a bit of an odd way of drafting it.

1600

I don't think that the minister's stated objective, as I indicated, is achieved by these further amendments, and I think, as a matter of principle, it gives the minister an enormous amount of unfettered power.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I just wanted to say that I appreciate the concern raised by the member for Markham, but I want to assure him that it's misplaced. Unfortunately, the Treasurer is rarely under my influence.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** But we're working on it.

**The Chair:** Shall the amendment to section 5 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This will be stacked with the others.

We'll now deal with section 6.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I move that section 6 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"6. Nothing in this act shall be interpreted or applied so as to reduce any right or entitlement under the Human Rights Code or under the Pay Equity Act."

I'd just like to explain very briefly that the act as it was originally written made sure that no entitlement under the Pay Equity Act would be reduced. This extends it to make sure also that no entitlements under the Human Rights Code will be affected as well.

**Mr Stockwell:** The question I have upon reading section 6—I've just read it too—it would seem to me that if you read subsection 22(3) of the act on page 13, it says, "A non-bargaining unit employee has no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act in respect of actions taken by his or her employer in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan." So, in essence, you're taking away any rights to grieve. How would you know if someone's going to grieve under this particular situation, when you've taken away all their rights to grieve?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I've listened to the advice of people with legal minds, but it seems to me there's a big difference between a traditional grievance and a complaint under the Human Rights Code. That's what this is designed to do, to protect complaints under the Human Rights Code.

**Mr Stockwell:** Just quickly to follow up, the Human Rights Code and Pay Equity Act are being recommended here, but it goes completely counter to what you've said in 22(3), where you've taken away all, under any act. Should you not straighten it out there as well, if you're going to do that?

**The Chair:** Minister, if you want to take your time to look, please.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Okay. If I might, I hope this addresses the problem of the member for Etobicoke West, because subsection 22(3) is quite clear: "A non-bargaining unit employee has no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act in respect of actions taken by his or her employer in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan," which means under this act.

I fail to understand the concern of the member. We've made sure that the Human Rights Code cannot be affected, complaints under the Human Rights Code. All we're saying is that there's no right to grieve under the Public Service Act if it has to do with conditions

that are being applied because of this act.

**Mr Stockwell:** Then the question is, and if you just read a little further, you might reach my concern, you have no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act. It's very clear: "or any other act." Now you're saying—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** In respect of this bill.

**Mr Stockwell:** Yes, in respect to the agreement. Now you're saying "excluding the Pay Equity Act." Should that not be added as an amendment to 22(3)?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I thought that putting it in section 6 would mean that you wouldn't have to put it in any other section in the bill, that by putting it right up front or as close to the front as possible under section 6 that it just makes that assumption through the rest of the bill both in terms of the Pay Equity Act and the Human Rights Code.

**Mr Stockwell:** So you can't grieve for any other reason, wrongful dismissal. You can't grieve for anything according to any act except what you've outlined in section 6. Those are the only two reasons you can grieve, period, if anyone's trying to implement this piece of legislation.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Only if it's attached to conditions as a result of this act.

**Mr Stockwell:** I don't mean to belabour this. If it's attached to the conditions of this act, you can grieve no other reason, under any conditions or acts at all, for wrongful dismissal, for any reason except these two exceptions.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If employers acted outside the terms of this particular act, then of course they would be in violation of the act, and it would be appropriate to grieve under those circumstances.

**Mr Stockwell:** Lastly, the point I think is being missed. As long as they live within this act, they can operate outside the terms of the law except for these two acts. You can dismiss somebody if you say it's part of your plan. You can dismiss somebody according to the plan and not have any worry about wrongful dismissal or any repercussions by that employee at all unless he cites the Pay Equity Act or she cites the Human Rights Code. Those are the only two reasons you can grieve for wrongful dismissal at all, if you've just followed the plan as laid down in this piece of legislation.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I won't repeat what I said before. I'm going to add something to that, that if an employer is required to post the plan and if there's something wrong with that plan, it can be challenged to an adjudicator who must make a ruling, so that there is the safeguard, I hope and I believe, in the act that will prevent abuses by employers, for example. I think that's important to note at this point, in view of your comments.

**Mr Beer:** Just a question on this: Treasurer, this covers the Human Rights Code and the Pay Equity Act, but I take it that the act still overrides the Employment Standards Act which also has some entitlements. I see a nodding head.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** That's correct. As long as it's in keeping with the spirit of this act.

**Mr Cousens:** I'm following up on the point made by the member for Etobicoke West. What is stopping the Human Rights Code from being part of every act and all acts in the province of Ontario? In other words, legally, if you had forgotten to put this in, would it have given you the right as a government to not pay attention to the Human Rights Code? I'm saying, therefore, is it absolutely mandatory to be in there?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I guess you could debate that depending on what happened subsequent to the act being passed, but this certainly makes it very clear that this act can't be used to get around the law, namely, the Human Rights Code. That's the purpose of making it very clear in this bill.

**Mr Murphy:** I have a question for the minister related to the comment from the member for York North to the extent that it overrides the Employment Standards Act, and that obviously has provisions relating to severance and termination pay. There may be some employers where the over-50 employees, the other rules relating to extended pay would come into effect perhaps, in some circumstances, in order to meet the target. If those are overridden, I'm wondering whether you can provide insurance that employees are going to receive anything, what they're going to receive under this act and how that differs from what they'd receive under the Employment Standards Act, and if so, by how much.

1610

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm not sure I understand the full impact of the member's question, but one reason this is here: If, for example, in the critical services area there was a requirement, because of the need of that particular employer to meet its expenditure reduction targets and the 12 days—let me use the 12 days as an example—that the 12 days couldn't be achieved because of the critical nature of the service the employees provided and that the savings could be achieved under what would normally be paid holidays, then there is a provision that says that will be stretched out beyond the length of this social contract so that those workers would be protected in the longer run, but at the same time would allow the employer to accomplish that, given the targets it would have. If you didn't have that requirement in the bill, then it might be impossible for some employers, where there are such critical areas of service to be delivered, to achieve their savings targets.

**Mr Murphy:** Just to follow up, the question I have is: For example, if a non-bargaining unit employee is to



be laid off under a provision of a plan within the confines of this bill that meet the minister's criteria, the employee gets laid off, doesn't have access to the Employment Standards Act provisions that might have otherwise entitled him to severance termination pay, depending on the circumstances, the question then is, how much would he be entitled to as an individual under this bill versus what he might have been entitled to under the Employment Standards Act, which no longer applies because of this bill?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm trying to sort it out. It applies only to hours of work, paid holidays; it's not meant to be draconian in nature, simply—

**Mr Jim Wilson:** "I'm sorry it is, but it's not meant to be."

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think we can debate all over again the principles of the bill, which we did on second reading, I say to the member for York Centre, but I don't think that's the purpose of our exercise this afternoon.

There's no override. I'm just handed a note, "Does not override the notice of termination pay, for example." It wouldn't override that.

**Mr Cousens:** How do you figure that out? Where does it say that?

**The Chair:** Order. The member for Markham, please take your seat. There is a debate, there is a conversation going on between the two members and obviously that conversation has not terminated, therefore I must give them the floor. Once you take the floor after that, I will make sure that your debate continues. It's as simple as that.

**Mr Murphy:** Thank you, Mr Chair. Minister, I'm reading subsection 22(3): "A non-bargaining unit employee has no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act...."

There are ways in which you can bring forward under the Employment Standards Act your concern regarding being laid off without adequate compensation. The question is, does this provision—you've indicated that it doesn't override it; my concern is that it might override it. Your section 6 amendment says, "To cover that off, we're going to say the Human Rights Code and Pay Equity Act have provisions specifically within them to provide for complaint mechanisms under the Human Rights Code and the Pay Equity Act."

The question is: For example, under the Employment Standards Act there is also a mechanism for employees to complain about being laid off without appropriate severance determination. My concern is that this subsection 22(3) would catch the Employment Standards Act and may then exclude those employees from complaining about being terminated. Then the question is, what compensation does this act provide that's in any way different, better than the Employment Standards Act?

**Mr Stockwell:** That's what I said.

**Mr Murphy:** The member for Etobicoke West is saying, "That's what I said," and I agree. I think I started this by saying, "Following up on his question." So my concern is that this provision would have the effect of catching the Employment Standards Act. There is no saving provision such as your amendment to section 6, and therefore my concern is that you're going to have an employee whom an employer could lay off without protection, without severance, without termination, and this act permits it.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** For me, the comfort in this section is in the first subsection of 22,

"The provisions of a non-bargaining unit plan prevail over any provision in any other act or the regulations thereunder that relates to"—and this is where the comfort is, for me anyway—"holidays, vacations, hours of work or overtime pay, but only to the extent that the provisions authorize measures that would be authorized under part VII if that part applied to the employer's non-bargaining unit employees."

If an employer acts outside the Employment Standards Act, it would seem to me that would be a violation of the law, and that would look after it.

**The Chair:** Are you satisfied, the member for St George-St David?

**Mr Murphy:** Well, I don't think we're ever satisfied.

**The Chair:** I will now recognize the member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** In order to deal with some of the failings the government has raised by its amendment by including the Human Rights Code as one of the protectors that really has to be inherent to what the bill is all about, I am tabling therefore an amendment to the amendment. It would just add to the words after "Pay Equity Act" "or under the Employment Standards Act or the Labour Relations Act." I had one copy here in these circumstances.

What that would begin to do is then to give protection under these other very important acts which are very current to the Legislature, and maybe it's the kind of thing that the minister will accept even now without having—you could even take the credit for that motion if you wanted to.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I would never want to take credit for anything that the member for Markham initiated. I do view his amendment as being appropriately motivated. My concern with what he's moving, though, is that if you added the Employment Standards Act and the Labour Relations Act to the list, it would be counter to subsection 22(1), which deals with the holidays, vacations, hours of work or overtime pay. It seems to me that if we're going to achieve the savings, which after all is a major purpose of this piece of

legislation, we need to maintain the right of this particular act to override certain other acts, with the cautions that are contained herein.

**Mr Cousens:** On that very issue, when you start pointing to 22(1), that really relates to working on holidays and other times, whereas these are two very implicit acts to what labour understands Ontario to be all about. That's the kind of theme our caucus is looking at here, and it makes sense that you at least incorporate that intention of support and understanding for those bills at the very beginning.

We've spent I don't know how long on the Labour Relations Act, but up till some of the other pieces of legislation were brought in, that's the piece, Bill 40, that this government has done so much for labour. Why not include something in here that protects it? Number two, the Employment Standards Act—it just allows too much freedom for people along the way if you don't have some guidance that that can give.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It seems to me that since one of the ways in which we will achieve the \$2 billion in savings that are laid out as the purpose of this bill—not in the bill itself, but one of the reasons we're doing this is to achieve \$2 billion in savings, and that is obtained largely through the pay freeze, the wage freeze, and the days off without pay. If you put in here the Employment Standards Act and the Labour Relations Act and, for example, there was a challenge to us doing the wage freeze and the days off without pay under one of those acts, then it seems to me you can kiss goodbye to any savings, ie, \$2 billion that we want to achieve under this bill.

**Mr Stockwell:** I heard you state in your answer to the member for St George-St David that if they did make a decision that was contrary, they would be falling outside the law.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If it's not covered.

**Mr Stockwell:** Right. The question I have for you is, the acts that are in place are in fact the law, any of the acts you operate under as far as wrongful dismissal or termination etc are concerned. They are the law, sir. Reading subsection 22(3), "or any other act in respect of actions taken by his or her employer in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan," if you remove all other acts, you're in fact removing the law, are you not?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm saying that in order to achieve what's laid out in this bill there is going to be a necessity in some cases to override other acts or the savings will not be achieved.

1620

**Mr Stockwell:** So in fact this piece of legislation is drafted in such a way that it allows employers to break existing laws to create their savings.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, we're lawmakers, not lawbreakers. What this would do would make this act

take precedence over other acts. Following the rules under this act, because of the comfort that's given in these sections, it means you're not breaking any laws.

**Mr Stockwell:** I guess the question's better said this way: Without this piece of legislation, you'd be breaking the law. Agreed?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** If there weren't these overrides provided in this bill, in some cases that's correct, absolutely.

**Mr Murphy:** Minister, same theme of questions relating to section 33 of the bill and specifically subsection 33(4): It's a limitation on a proceeding being brought against an employer. Your comment with respect to subsection 22(1) would, at least to some degree, apply with respect to subsection 33(3), but the wording of subsection 33(4) appears to imply that an employee can't bring a proceeding in relation to the release and does not have a limitation related to holidays, vacations, hours of work or overtime pay, as a more general section.

I'm wondering if this section would bring in the same concerns we've been raising with respect to section 22, which we were talking about just before. Then, in that circumstance, there might be some override of the Employment Standards Act by virtue of this and, therefore, a complete bar to any action of any kind. I think "proceeding" is usually defined fairly broadly and can include anything from a grievance to an action. It seems to me that this could be interpreted as overriding that Employment Standards Act guarantee in circumstances to which this section 33 applies.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The member, I think, is referring to subsection 33(4), and that is a section where we are moving an amendment to make sure that the limitations on the right to proceed or to sue—I'm not a learned legal friend—would be limited to the fail-safe part; ie, the salary freeze, the unpaid leaves and the special leaves. There's a restriction on the right to sue, limited to those three areas of the fail-safe part of this bill.

**Mr Phillips:** Very quickly, because I know that in the future someone will use this section and say, "You were very specific that nothing in the act shall be interpreted to reduce any entitlement, only under two acts, pay equity and the Human Rights Code," can the minister, with the assistance perhaps of his legal staff, indicate to the members, just so we know what we're getting into, what acts this bill will have the authority to override? I gather it's the Employment Standards Act. I gather it may be the Ontario Labour Relations Act. Are there any other bills where it has the authority to override?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** One that comes to mind immediately is the Public Service Act, and I'm trying to think if there are any others: in certain conditions the



Employment Standards Act, the Labour Relations Act and the teachers' collective bargaining act. But in all cases it's override in relation to the provisions of this bill, yes.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey):** Not highway traffic.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Not the Ontario Highway Traffic Act, no.

**Mr Murphy:** To follow up, Minister, you referred to an amendment that you said was going to limit section 33. I have three piles of government amendments and I'm just wondering if you could perhaps point out which one you're referring to.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm referring to subsection—I better make sure I've got the right one—33(4). I can tell you what it reads if that helps, that 33(4) be struck out and the following substituted:

“(4) Actions of an employer taken in accordance with section 24, 25 or 26 shall not be the subject of any proceedings brought by any person against an employer.”

Then you have to of course go back to 24, 25 and 26 and look at the provisions therein.

**The Chair:** Any further questions or comments to the amendment to section 6?

**Mr Cousens:** The amendment to the amendment first, Mr Chairman.

**The Chair:** Before we proceed to the vote, I would like to remind the member for Markham that your subamendment to the amendment is out of order because it is past 4 of the clock, and if you recall when I read, I said, “All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the Assembly by 4 o'clock.” Therefore, I declare your subamendment to the amendment out of order.

We will now vote on the amendment to section 6. Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Therefore the vote is stacked.

**Mr Cousens:** My next amendment is on section 7, Mr Chairman.

**The Chair:** I just asked the question, are there any other amendments to section 6? If not, we will proceed to section 7. Minister?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** No, I have no amendments to section 7.

**Mr Cousens:** Mine is the next amendment, section 7, Mr Chairman.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I don't want to waste a lot of time, but the subamendment that you ruled out of order was because we didn't have

it in at 4 o'clock. With all due respect to the Chair and the other parties, the opposition and the government, we didn't have the amendment at 4 o'clock. Well, maybe we had the amendment at 10 to 4 or whatever. Certainly, we didn't have a copy of it here, nor did the person have the amendment who wanted to read it. To expect the opposition parties to invent the government amendments and then invent subamendments to the invented government amendments is maybe asking a tad much.

**The Chair:** You know, frankly, there's nothing I can do, because I am advised here by the paper what I have to do and it says it very clearly, that the amendments have got to be brought in by 4 o'clock. There's nothing I can do to change that.

**Mr Stockwell:** There's nothing you can do? Well, with all due respect, yes, there is. You're the Chair. You can understand the situation that we're in as opposition parties. Having not been given the opportunity of reading the amendment, how could we possibly know what our subamendment would be? I ask for unanimous consent to allow the subamendment to stand, please.

**Mr Murphy:** On a point of order.

**The Chair:** Just a minute, please. Is there unanimous consent? No, there is no unanimous consent. On a point of order, the member for St George-St David.

**Mr Murphy:** Yes, Mr Chair. I would like just to join in at least on principle with the comment made by the member for Etobicoke West and I think place on record our concern that it is highly unfair, it seems to me, to have a set of rules that say that you cannot propose an amendment after 4 o'clock, and then the government introduces a set of amendments at 10 to 4, and then presuming that we have an opportunity to analyse and assess them in the short period of time and to prepare an amendment.

It's been our position that this bill's unworkable from the start. I think the haste is obvious from this, but I think it's important to place on the record that this is frankly an entirely unfair way to run the business of the Legislature.

**The Chair:** Perhaps the House should look at this at a further date.

The member for Markham, you have an amendment to section 7.

1630

**Mr Cousens:** Yes, and I will move that amendment to section 7. I thank the member for Etobicoke West for his support on our amendment. It's the difficulty in trying to deal with a very, very complex and difficult bill in the very short time frame we have to deal with it. The limit to the debate is that there might be—

**The Chair:** Will you please move the amendment?

**Mr Cousens:** I'm about to do that. I have the floor and I will do it right now.

There might be the sense that we're moving forward in such a way that maybe the House would be unanimous to allow us to continue the debate on these amendments till later on tonight, but we'll suggest that at a later time this afternoon.

I move that section 7 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections.

"Targets to be equal in percentage terms

"(5) An expenditure reduction target, or other reduction or limitation on amounts payable, established or prescribed under this act shall be equal in percentage terms among sectors and within sectors, having regard to the compensation of employees and other persons except for such employees as are referred to in paragraph 3 of subsection 11(3).

"Reduced expenditure equal in percentage terms

"(6) Subsection (5) does not apply to the minister's obligation to establish lower expenditure reduction targets under subsection 7(2) but a lower expenditure target established under subsection 7(2) shall be equal in percentage terms among and within sectors, having regard to the compensation of employees and other persons except for such employees as are referred to in paragraph 3 of subsection 11(3)."

The first thing that's implicit to this is that we title section 5, "Targets to be equal in percentage terms." In other words, there would be no one group within the sectors that would have anything higher than 5% that would be ascribed to them. The limit then is at 5%, so that if in fact another group has been targeted by the government, for whatever reason, to be responsible for more than 5% to help the government achieve its \$2 billion, this would prevent, for instance—this is what I referred to yesterday as we talked about this—doctors then would not be a target of the government.

There's a situation in the Frontenac County Board of Education, and there is the sense within that board that it is being targeted for more than the 5%. What we're really trying to do with these amendments is to establish that the percentage of saving that the government will get from any of the sectors will not be more than the 5%. That becomes a limit. Beyond that, you'd have to find it within those groups.

We feel it doesn't take away from the objective of finding \$2 billion, but it does protect other groups from being attacked, undermined or in any way let down by a government that may have other agendas. This would force the government to be fair to all groups. That's the objective of this.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm somewhat puzzled by sub (5), which says, "Shall be equal in percentage terms among sectors and within sectors, having regard to the compensation of employees," which seems to be heading in the right direction and then it says, "except for such employees as are referred to in paragraph 3 of

subsection 11(3)," which deals with the low-income cutoff of under \$30,000.

If I read it correctly—and I stand to be corrected by the member for Markham in this regard—it would mean that the percentage that would be applied to a sector would disregard the number of low-income persons in that particular sector. Also, I think you would find it very inflexible to say that there should be the same percentage reduction applied to every sector.

**Mr Cousens:** In response to the Minister of Finance, what we're doing is putting a maximum, and the maximum is 5%, but it also ties in to a new look at subsection 11(3) where we're talking about those employees who are making less than \$30,000 annually. What we're really trying to do—as you'll see in some of our other amendments, as you would well understand—is that this is a way of somehow protecting them. It will tie into our future amendments where we have another way of dealing with it, so that if a sectoral group has come to an agreement where those who are in the under-\$30,000 group have been worked out and have met their terms, then that group would be satisfactory; but if another group by August 1 hasn't established an agreement, we would then invoke another section, which would mean you could look at those who are under \$30,000. This would protect the option that the government would then have to look at those who are in the lower-income bracket.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I just want to, on behalf of my colleagues, as the Health critic for the Ontario PC Party, make a few comments to this, through you to the Treasurer. I think it's a very reasonable amendment, and as the member for Markham has said, it simply attempts to cap the savings the government may want to achieve in any sector at 5%.

If we look at sections 34 through 39, we see some pretty draconian aspects of the legislation with respect to OHIP fees, physician payments, dispensing fees for pharmacists and a number of other items. I think what our worry is, and a number of the health care groups have come forward and asked us to express concern with respect to this issue, is that when we look at the expenditure control plan of the government and then look at Bill 48, which is before us now, we see that it's pretty unfair when it comes to physicians and pharmacists, to take two examples right now.

The government, under the expenditure control plan, is looking for a saving of \$1.6 billion out of the health care sector. Then in Bill 48 we see the wording, for example—you could take any of these sections, but section 34 says, "An amount that is payable by the crown in right of Ontario or the government of Ontario to an employer may be reduced by the prescribed amount." What we're attempting to do with this very reasonable amendment is to ensure that the prescribed amount, that is, an amount that may be sketched out in



regulations on which the public will have no input, not exceed 5%.

I'd appreciate the Treasurer's comments with respect to that, because it strikes me that this bill isn't very fair. In the case of physicians, in 1991 both the former Minister of Health, Frances Lankin, and all members of the government side bent over backwards to pat themselves on the back with respect to the collective agreement or the memorandum of understanding that the government had reached with the Ontario Medical Association. Part of that memorandum of understanding requires the government to work through the joint management committee which, as the name implies, is a committee established between the government and physicians and the OMA to negotiate OHIP fees, to negotiate thresholds with respect to physicians' salaries, physician payments, and what we see in Bill 48 is an override of the joint management committee process.

The member for Markham, on behalf of our caucus, with this amendment is simply trying to bring in some safeguards so that the government doesn't disproportionately hit certain sectors harder than others. If I may just conclude by pointing out the example of pharmacists: Bill 29 and this legislation, Bill 48, essentially gut the Ontario drug benefit program, the negotiation and mediation process spelled out there with respect to pharmacists and the government in terms of setting dispensing fees which are paid to pharmacists. It's draconian, and we're trying to help the government make this legislation less draconian and to make it fairer. I'd appreciate the Treasurer's comments with respect to the amendment.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'll try and respond to both members, the member for Simcoe West and the member for Markham.

First of all, what the member for Markham was saying I don't see as being reflected in his amendment: such as the maximum, such as 5%. I don't see that in the amendment. Perhaps I missed it, but I don't see it.

Secondly, I would caution the member as well on the same percentage. I'll give you an example: the community services sector, which the member for Simcoe West, I believe, raised earlier, indicating that while they had reached sectoral agreement, there are a lot of people below \$30,000 in that sector so it doesn't affect a lot of people. I believe the compensation reduction in that sector, I may not be exactly accurate on this number, but I think it comes to less than 1%, something like 0.8% of the total compensation in that sector. I think if you tried to apply a common percentage across the various sectors, we'd soon run into trouble, and this would get us into more trouble than it would solve problems.

1640

On the member for Simcoe West talking about the health care sector, when so many people in the province

are making a contribution to our financial problems, I can't imagine why doctors or pharmacists would be excluded from that. I think there would be an outcry in the province if we said, "We're going to effect all of these expenditure reductions and, secondly, with the social contract, a lot of people are going to have to make a sacrifice in order to get our financial house back in order," and then we said, "Because there's been an agreement signed with the Ontario Medical Association, it will be exempt."

There are agreements signed with all sorts of people in the public sector and they're not being exempted from this. So I would suggest that to move in the direction suggested by the member for Simcoe West would not be appropriate. I can understand, and I'm not suggesting that he's simply trying to protect his friends in the medical profession or the profession of pharmacy. I would never suggest that for a moment. Having seen the member for Simcoe West in full flight when he's angry, the last thing I want to do this afternoon is make him mad.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** It's an interesting little bit of political tap dancing we've seen from the Treasurer. I did not say exempt physicians or pharmacists. I did not say that, Treasurer, and I resent the fact that you got up and tried to twist around a reasonable argument I made.

The amendment speaks to ensuring that you don't pick on one sector more than others. Your own government admits that through the joint management committee over the past two years you've saved \$1 billion in health care, and you've done it primarily on the backs of physicians. The fact of the matter is you've done it in a relatively cooperative manner to date.

This legislation speaks to doing away with any of the joint management committee negotiating process, and your draconian intention, I assume, is to hit doctors, hit physicians and hit pharmacists extremely hard under Bill 48. What we're saying is, don't exempt them. They must take their fair share of the pain in order to help the government that has spent itself into oblivion correct its wrongs of the past. It's unfortunate that we're even debating this legislation today, but none the less, it is what we're doing.

I think what the Treasurer didn't respond to is the fact that under this legislation, the government may now delist any insured service. The Treasurer, Dr Floyd, Pink Slip Floyd—I call him Dr Floyd—Dr Ruth Grier, the Health minister, and bureaucrats are going to decide what services Ontarians need and deserve with respect to OHIP by allowing sections 34 through 39 to speak to prescribed amounts. The public has no assurance as to the extent of the cuts that are forthcoming and continuing in the health care sector. Our amendment simply intends to bring a reasonable balance.

I didn't hear the Treasurer respond to any of my specific comments. What he did was to play the politics

of old and simply try to twist around what I said. Now I know the NDP takes great pleasure in picking on doctors. They're a very anti-doctor government and they take great pleasure in picking on professionals.

But I dare say that some day the Treasurer may not feel well and he'll have to go to a physician, and you want to just make sure there are still some around, I say to the Treasurer, and that those physicians don't have a gun to their heads but still want to provide medical services to the people of Ontario.

This bill, I think, sends out the wrong signal. It sends out the signal to physicians, "It's politically expedient in this day and age to pick on you and to single you out, even though you've already done that through the expenditure control plan." They took the biggest whack of that, \$1.6 billion, and they've saved you a billion dollars over the last two years, in addition to that, through the joint management committee.

So I'd appreciate if the Treasurer would not play the politics of the past and would restrict his comments to the points that I actually raised and not the ones that he thinks I raised.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I appreciate the restraint being shown by the member for Simcoe West.

**Mr Murdoch:** We can only hold him down for so long.

**Mr Stockwell:** Don't start up now. I've got the key, Floyd.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm trying very hard not to tease the bears this afternoon, Mr Chairman.

I acknowledge that the member for Simcoe West didn't say, "Exempt the doctors," but I think he was implying that, through the expenditure control exercise and the social contract, we are somehow picking on doctors and pharmacists. I think that's a fair categorization of what he said.

I would simply say to the member for Simcoe West, first of all, we're not an anti-doctor government. That's nonsense. We respect very much the work that the medical profession performs. I would simply say to the member for Simcoe West—and I hope he won't characterize this as being politics of old—that something had to be done.

I'm not saying this to pick on the official opposition, but during the 1980s health care costs went up an average of 11% each year over the previous year. The Ontario drug benefit plan went up an average of 18% a year each year over the previous year. Now that was not sustainable.

I suppose when revenues were flowing in in record numbers, tax increases were being imposed in record numbers, at that point you could make some arguments that the system could afford some of that. But I think fairminded members would acknowledge that in the 1990s that is completely unsustainable, even if inflation

has dropped substantially. But something had to be done. We had to restrict the growth in health care costs.

Any government over here would have had to do the same thing. You might have done some things differently. You would have had to restrict the growth in public sector compensation. You might have done it differently as well. You might not have brought in a bill like this. I don't know what you would have done and you don't know either, and you wouldn't know unless you were here. If you'd asked me three years ago if I would be standing in my place debating a bill in my name like this, I would have said no as well. But let's face it, the problems of the day require that this kind of action be taken.

I would just simply conclude by saying to the member for Simcoe West that there's no attempt to pick on any particular sector, but I think that if you standardized the 5%, for example, maximum, which he implies, to each sector, we'd end up with enormous problems of fairness that wouldn't solve the problem of fairness. I think it would create more. So for those reasons, I could not support this amendment.

**Mr Phillips:** On section 7, I think the amendments we have before us illustrate the problem that we have with the whole section, and that is that, firstly, it once again gives to the minister an enormous hammer. If I'm not mistaken, it's a \$400-million hammer. You say to the groups, "Either you come to the sectoral table and reach an agreement or we're going to take \$400 million away from you." That may be a convenient hammer, but it's one that really intrudes on fairness in collective bargaining.

The second thing is that it's the minister alone who will make the determination on what the targets will be. I appreciate that the Conservative amendments are trying to impose some additional fairness into it, but I would say that subsections 7(1) through (4) build in an unfairness, firstly on the hammer. I would say, as we discussed last Wednesday—we got into this last Wednesday but we didn't get the answers.

The minister implies that it was a waste of time. It was not a waste of time for us, although the answers were. But I go back to the questions we raised then. What happens if a sectoral agreement can't be reached, but in the best interests, parties are working locally to try to reach an agreement? They still lose the \$400-million equivalent, I gather.

Secondly, is it true that it is the minister and the minister alone who determines what the expenditure targets will be sector by sector? It implies there are various ways of expressing it, but it is the minister only who will set those targets.

1650

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I guess I would explain the sectoral targets a little differently than does the member



for Scarborough-Agincourt. He calls it a hammer. I call it an incentive. I know that some people would argue that a hammer can be a pretty good incentive, but that's not how we view it.

The targets are laid out sector by sector, and if there are sectoral agreements, then that target is reduced. So there's an incentive to reach a sectoral agreement. You can call that a hammer if you like, but it seems to me that's a very strong incentive to achieve a sectoral agreement.

At that point, the local agreements can voluntarily kick in—we're talking now prior to August 1—and because of the local agreement being signed as well as the sectoral agreement, then there can be achieved access to the job security fund, which is \$100 million a year, and redeployment in the public service. I would say to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt that I think that it's a very responsible way to provide an incentive.

I hope very much that all eight sectors, by August 1, would sign sectoral agreements which would allow the local agreements then to take effect. But he's right when he suggests that if there's no sectoral agreement, if they haven't taken advantage of that incentive, then the target is not reduced for that particular sector.

**Mr Phillips:** I realize you call it an incentive. I will just say that firstly, if it was private sector bargaining and this was a company and it said, "You have until August 1 to agree to our terms or we cut our offer by 20%"—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Phillips:** I'm going to go forward, I hope. The minister says, "Go back." But if you were to say to anyone in the private sector, a union in the private sector, "You must come to agreement on those terms or you lose 20% of the offer," they would view that as bad-faith bargaining. I will predict that there will be many, many, many employers and employees who, once they see the sectoral agreement that's been reached, will have real difficulty locally.

I will say it because the gun is to their heads, and the people who are at those sectoral tables will say: "Well, I'm sorry. If we didn't reach the agreement in four weeks, we lose the equivalent of \$400 million." The Minister of Finance may say that's an incentive. I will say that's a hammer that is at the head of everyone at that sectoral table. It's a, pardon the expression, damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don't situation.

You can do that. That's why we have a problem with it, Mr Minister. You can do that, and I unfortunately think I see the consequences of that, which are that in 9,000 local collective agreements there will have been imposed conditions from the sectoral table that will change dramatically the relationship between the employers and the employees. That's why we have

difficulty with this section.

We would have preferred, as you all know, a very, very simple bill, done weeks ago, that would have allowed local collective agreements to take place.

This section 7 is the section that begins to really impose on local collective agreements. As I say, we have a problem with that. The Conservative amendments attempt, in a small way, to add, I guess, some certainty in the allocations, but the first four points under section 7 give the minister such enormous power that regardless of what these amendments are, he has the power to exercise that authority.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I just wanted to make sure that the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, and I suspect he understands it—make it very clear that a sectoral agreement can't bind a local agreement. It has to be signed on locally.

What is possible, of course, is that if a sectoral agreement, with the employee representatives there at the table, is arrived at, then the local agreements can indicate that's their local agreement. They can sign on and say: "That's it. For us that's our local agreement." That's fine. So much the better, in my view. But at the same time, they don't have to do that. They can negotiate a local agreement with their employer.

I wouldn't want to leave the impression with anyone that the sectoral agreement is imposing something that would be unwanted or undesirable at the local level.

**Mr Murphy:** Comment on the amendment moved by the Progressive Conservatives: I've got a package of stuff now recently provided to me, up to about 30 amendments showing the unworkability of the bill.

The question I have is, if the mover is still here with the Conservatives, that I have some difficulty understanding the provision related to having regard to the compensation of employees in the sense of how it impacts upon percentages applying to sectors and within sectors.

Specifically, I met, for example, today with members of a foundation within my riding that provided provincial funding of about two thirds of its total funding. Most of the people within the organization earn less than \$30,000 because of the nature of the organization. What I don't understand is how this would apply to them. Does "having regard to" that compensation mean that this foundation would not have to implement any reductions at all? While I understand the spirit of trying to make amendments to recognize these difficulties, I'm not sure this is going to achieve it and reflects, I think, some of the unworkability of the bill.

I was thinking, for example, as well of workers in the day care sector, who are recognized to be among the lowest-paid groups of people providing service to our society. I'm wondering too, for example, in that aspect, would that mean the day care part of the broader public

service has to face a lesser reduction in the transfer from the provincial government because of the wording of this amendment? "Having regard to" is a very difficult and imprecise phrase, and I think it's not a workable way to achieve what I think is trying to be achieved.

**Mr Cousens:** It's an opinion and I respect the fact that it is an opinion, but what we're really looking at is that there has to be some control, there has to be some equity right across the board. We believe this will bring equity among all the sectors so that there isn't going to be any sector that's going to be differently treated—that's the key to it—and that the reduced expenditure will be equal in percentage terms.

That's really where we're coming from, and as you consider your views, I think it's exciting that you're finally participating in the debate. It's just too bad that—I know where you're coming from. You haven't supported any amendments so far. It's probably your intention not to support any right now. I think we've had enough debate on it. I'd suggest we get on, vote on it and get to the next one.

**Mr Murphy:** I'm a little concerned that activities I'm engaged in are causing the member to be excited, but I don't think I heard in that an answer to the question I posed to the mover related to how they envision that working in terms of—for example, it says the expenditure reduction would be equal within a sector, but having regard to that compensation.

I'm wondering whether that means that where a sector under paragraph 3 of subsection 11(3) primarily has employees earning less than \$30,000, that sector would not have to achieve expenditure targets, or would it then have to, none the less, achieve them despite that fact?

1700

**Mr Cousens:** You've missed the point. If you will look at the amendment, sections 25 to 32 are removed. We bring in a number of other amendments where this will then fit into it.

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** I have a comment to the Minister of Finance. In the interest of accommodation, I think it would be helpful if the Minister of Finance would recognize the fact that there are different times, and to allude back to things that happened in our government is really not helpful. Looking around, until very recently you were the only member of the Legislature when the 1985 accord was entered into. I remember that at the time, a lot of negotiations went on. There were, I think, 18 points that had to be established, after which the support of the NDP would be given to the Liberals. I don't recall one single point that said, "We will only support you if you reduce the health care costs." I don't think that was on the table. I don't remember that being part of the accord. As a matter of fact, I don't remember one single

item that came up for discussion in which it was suggested that something should be cut back. If anything, almost every one of the provisions, in order to get the support of the NDP for the change of government, was that there would be certain things expanded; certain policies would be expanded to include people who were not at that particular time accommodated.

The other thing is that—I'm not being critical; I just want to put it into perspective—in the 1990-91 budget, there was a totally different approach to what you're doing now. Again, different times call for different approaches. You have done a total 180-degree reversal from the statements that you can read in the preamble to your budget of 1990-91, in which you stated that you were not prepared to fight the recession on the backs of the workers and that you were not going to address the deficit and all of those things.

Again, Mr Minister of Finance, I'm not being critical. All I'm saying is that different times require different solutions, and it is not helpful to have you and members of your government constantly trying to portray that you now have all of the answers, you've always had all of the answers, and that if only previous governments had had the same wisdom that you now have, we wouldn't be in this situation. I'm only suggesting that we are all part of the problem and we all have to be part of the solution. I think it would be helpful if we laid aside that particular rhetoric and dealt with the problem that everybody acknowledges is a problem and is something that we have to address.

**The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Does the Minister of Finance have a reply?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** On this particular section of the bill to which the member for Wilson Heights refers, I did try to say in my response to the member for Simcoe West that the health care costs went up at a certain rate of increase during the 1980s which was unsustainable. I think the member for Wilson Heights would agree with that. I wasn't blaming the Liberals for that when I said it. I said those were different times. There were revenues coming in that were natural increases in the growth in the economy that made all sorts of things possible. The rate of inflation was higher in the 1980s; I acknowledged that.

My only point to the member for Simcoe West was that the rate of increase was not sustainable in the 1990s and that we had to take action, and if that meant the health care sector had to be part of the restraint exercise, then so be it, that's the way it had to be. It wasn't meant to be a slam at the free-spending habits of the Liberals in the 1980s.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Over the course of the last couple of months, as we've been looking at the proposals of the government in the area of this social contract legislation and also the response from the third party, I've had occasion to chide the third party for its



position or lack thereof. When I saw the package of amendments that was put forward, I started to understand why they're having some difficulty opposing the legislation. It's obvious that the third party at this point just hasn't understood that this legislation is so bad that it can't be amended.

I'd like to point out why the amendment that is before us doesn't fix the legislation, from my reading, and ask the Minister of Finance if my analysis of what this amendment would do is an accurate one. I'm not attempting at this point to be overly partisan or engage in rhetoric. What I'm looking at is a proposal that I believe is fundamentally flawed and is not going to achieve the purpose the government has established for itself. I don't believe the amendment that's before us is going to achieve that goal either.

One of the concerns we've expressed in a piece of legislation that intrudes in a centralized way into that which we believe can only be resolved locally is the fact that every municipality, college, university, school board and hospital is functioning in a relatively different environment. We also know that there are some of those transfer partners—and we refer to them as “transfer partners” because of their relationship with the provincial government. They are the employers of those over 800,000 workers who are not in the direct employ of the provincial government but are still considered part of the broader public sector.

Some of those employers have negotiated wage freezes and days off without pay already. It's my view that this amendment would be very unfair and hamper the flexibility that would be required to make sure that where you've had employers already take that kind of action—a change to this bill that said it has to be the same within the sector and between the sectors will not allow an acknowledgement of that which has taken place already.

As I ask the question, I see the Treasurer is prepared to respond. My concern is that the legislation as it stands now isn't flexible enough to be able to respond to that reality. I think the amendment that's been put forward here further ties the hands of those managers and employers locally who require that kind of flexibility and could, in my opinion, do so in a local collective bargaining environment if they had a very clear and established number from the Treasurer and perhaps a framework agreement of how the Treasurer had dealt with his own employees, both unionized and non-unionized, to achieve his own suggested target.

I'd like his response to my concern that what this amendment does is reduce the amount of flexibility for local solutions to be found.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I agree with the member for Oriole that the bill as it now stands is better than what the amendment would make it. I don't think that will convince the member for Oriole to support it, so I don't

know why I should bother entertaining the rest of her comments.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Given that I and the member for Markham raised a number of points and that the member for Markham moved this motion, I just want to indicate, also given the time constraints, that we perhaps should move to a vote on this PC amendment.

1710

**Mrs Caplan:** I have some real concerns about the discussion around this amendment and others, because I think this amendment suggests that it's going to do something which it simply can't and will not do.

**Mr Stockwell:** In your opinion.

**Mrs Caplan:** In my opinion, and I'm expressing my view at this point in time because this is the opportunity that we have, an opportunity to debate not only the bill but the amendments to it, which the third party is purporting will fix this bill.

The concern that I have, and I've said clearly and I understand the Minister of Finance's sensitivity about the fact that I don't think his bill will do it, but the point I'm making is this amendment won't make it better. This amendment in fact will make it worse because it will restrict whatever flexibility the existing legislation, as it stands now, might afford and provide to employers.

What I would like him to speak to is, does he feel that this amendment is more restrictive than the existing legislation out there for managers and employers in the broader public sector?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Yes, I didn't mean to be so dismissive in my previous comment, but I do believe that the amendment put by the member for Markham is unduly restrictive, does not allow flexibility, does not recognize the differences in the various sectors. I think that for those reasons I would not support the amendment put forth by the member for Markham.

**Mrs Caplan:** I appreciate the clarification from the Minister of Finance because this amendment that's being put forward by the third party, the Progressive Conservative Party, is suggesting that it will make this legislation more flexible and fairer when in fact a reading of this amendment suggests to me and to others in this House that it will do exactly the opposite. It's the reason I don't believe this legislation can be fixed, but more than that, this amendment will not fix it.

I've heard some, shall I say, interjections by some honourable members in this House about what would we do instead, and I would like to take this opportunity, because we're looking at the first of a very significant package of amendments to attempt to fix a bill which I don't believe is fixable, and so if I could, while I'm on my feet and while I have the floor, I would like to put forward to the Minister of Finance another option which I think he could consider instead—

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: We are now doing amendments clause by clause. The honourable member for Oriole, I would just have to suggest to you that we are now going seriatim through the bill. It would not be the time to go off that particular section.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Oriole, do you have some rapid remarks?

**Mrs Caplan:** I will be brief. I do believe that rather than attempting to amend a bill which is so fundamentally flawed as to be unfixable, I think the Minister of Finance could withdraw this legislation. He could very clearly say to his own employees, who are in the excluded group, "This is how we are going to achieve expenditure reduction."

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: Not more than half an hour ago, we had a sub-amendment ruled out of order because it wasn't in by 4 o'clock. We have a raft of amendments to go through, and I'm not being critical of the Liberal Party but they offered not one—let me finish, please—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm not finished, Mr Chair. They've offered not one written amendment. I hardly think it's in order or appropriate for the member for Oriole to start outlining the Liberal position on this bill when they offered no amendments at all.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Oriole, we're working on an amendment to section 7 of the bill. Please address that amendment or we will vote.

**Mrs Caplan:** I think the comments from the member for Etobicoke West speak to exactly why I'm making the point that I'm making, and that is that the amendment to section 7 of the bill, as put forward, is not going to fix the bill. The proposals that we have put forward and that I'm putting forward instead of this amendment—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We are not in a position to accept proposals or subamendments.

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm not putting forward a specific amendment to this bill because this bill is not amendable. I am suggesting to the Treasurer and to the Minister of Finance what he could do instead of this and saying to my friends from the third—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** On section 7.

**Mrs Caplan:** Yes, I am. Rather than section 7, what he could do is establish clear expenditure targets, announce how he is going to deal with that for his own employees, negotiate a framework agreement with his union and then begin that implementation. Then that, as a model agreement, could solve the problem that section 7 of this bill will not be fixed by this amendment that's been put.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Thank you. We are now

ready to vote on the amendment.

*Interjections.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order, please. We are moving to vote on the amendment to section 7. Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendment carry?

All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

This amendment will be stacked till 5:45.

Shall sections 8 through 10 carry, as originally submitted? Agreed? No.

All those in favour of sections 8 through 10 please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Sections 8 through 10, carried.

We now move to an amendment to subsection (11), moved by Mr Cousens.

**Mr Cousens:** I move that subsection 11(3) of the bill be amended by deleting the words "in the opinion of the minister."

I know that there are a number of members, my colleagues from our caucus, who did want to comment on this, and I did put a few points on the record yesterday, but the bill gives extensive powers to the Minister of Finance in ruling on: What is the plan? Who is in the plan? What is the sectoral framework? What sectoral framework will be considered? By taking out "in the opinion of the minister," it removes this business where there's a non-technical, non-scientific approach.

I realize that the honourable minister probably has a good opinion on some things, but I just don't want to leave it to his discretion and his determination or the guidance of others who might be around him, to make up his mind in ways that are not consistent with what has been absolutely confirmed within the bill. This is one of those limiting acts on the minister that would just cause him to be accountable to the legislation, and in that sense it would mean that he does not have the absolute, complete freedom that the bill now gives.

I don't know of another instance in Ontario law where you'll come along and you'll see that kind of power given to a minister. It now reads, "The minister shall not designate a plan as a sectoral framework, unless in the opinion of the minister, the plan meets the following criteria," and it goes down and it delineates what those criteria are, as it has to do with who is in it, what the plan is, what the support is for the plan, what the provisions are in it, the different classes. So there are a number of things around it.

It is a powerful, powerful clause that we would just say, may the minister let his wings be a little clipped by having that removed from it. We would feel much better



to see "in the opinion of the minister" removed from that section.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** We also have an amendment to this section, but I'll deal with the amendment put forth by the member for Markham first.

At some point someone has to exercise some judgement in this regard. If there's going to be a sectoral agreement, because it is such a powerful incentive and because there's a lot of dollars involved if the sectoral agreements are achieved, to allow lower expenditure reduction targets and to then allow the local agreements to kick in with those lower targets, it's important that there be the opportunity for some judgement to be exercised as to when there should be a sectoral agreement.

1720

If I could move to the Conservative amendment that deals with 50% of employers and 50% of employees being a requirement for a sectoral agreement, that one bothers me a great deal because I can think of a case where in a particular sector you could have one or two large employers with perhaps 60% of the employees represented, and you could have an agreement with them, which would be more than 50% of employees but it would be less than 50% of the employers. I think it would be unfair to that sector and to the employees who work in it at the local level, in particular, to not be able to take advantage of a sectoral agreement by people who represented more than 50% of the employees.

I hope that's not too convoluted an explanation, but for that reason I would reject the Conservative amendment, not because I think it's an attempt to undermine anything in the bill—I think it's a well-intentioned amendment—but for those reasons I would caution against supporting it, because I think it could rule out the recognition of a sectoral agreement when 60% or 70% of the employees in that sector will be able to take advantage of it even though fewer than 50% of employers employed that very large percentage of employees. For that reason, I would not accept this amendment.

**Mr Cousens:** In response to that, we have another amendment that does go and put the definitions on how many would be allowed to, if you were to look at the sector, that 50% would be required to participate, so we come in future amendments on it. I apologize that when I made my introductory comments I didn't draw that to your attention and remind you of it, but that is the plan. We've moved further in other sections of the bill that would do that.

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I understand where the mover is coming from on this and I have a great deal of sympathy for the point he's making, but unfortunately, I don't think the motion, even if passed, would be effective. Even if the words "in the opinion of the minister" were not there in black and white, they

would be implicitly.

The bottom line is that I think everyone recognizes that economics is hardly a science. Perhaps the method by which we gather the information could be deemed to be a science, but at some point somebody has to interpret the information and make some kind of a judgement. The minister would at some point, obviously, have to be offering his opinion, and whether or not we have those words in there, implicitly they are and the minister will be offering his opinion.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think he's responding to the amendment put by the member for Markham rather than what's in the bill.

**Mrs Caplan:** The amendment that's put forward to subsection 11(3), while I think it's well intended, will not fix this bill. The reason I say that is that this bill is an intrusion into collective bargaining in the province of Ontario unlike what we have ever seen in the past. I predict that as a result of Bill 48, collective bargaining in Ontario will be for ever changed. The powers of the minister will not be diminished simply by deleting the words "in the opinion of the minister."

I believe as well that just by deleting those few words you will not restore a climate of good faith for bargaining. I believe this bill eliminates an environment of good faith and goodwill. In fact, I think Bill 48 will breed an environment of not only bad faith, but of tensions which could be avoided if we opted for local solutions rather than impose central command and control kinds of solutions.

The concern I have with this amendment is that it's a very simplistic response to an area of intrusionary powers of a Minister of Finance into all aspects of collective bargaining in the province which not only is unheard of in the province of Ontario, but simply removing those words, "in the opinion of the minister" in subsection 11(3), as well intended as they are, will not fix the fundamental flaw in this legislation.

I think the Minister of Finance said it very clearly in his response to this proposal, and while I'm very sympathetic to what the member for Markham is attempting to do in moving this, I hope he'll agree with me that when you look at this, this does not fix the bill. It still gives the Minister of Finance huge and enormous intrusionary powers. Again, I believe the alternative to this kind of intrusion of the Minister of Finance would be to see him withdraw this bill and allow for local solutions through good-faith collective bargaining among the employers and the employees who are part of the broader public sector.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I would disagree with the member for Oriole on a couple of points. One, I don't think it's a simplistic amendment. I think it's designed to make sure that the powers of the minister, the judgement of the minister of the day is curtailed and

restrained by the bill, so it's not wide open for judgement. That's correct. I understand that. I think that's a natural inclination by opposition. I can recall in another life engaging in similar debates and I remember the reception I got from the other side of the House in those days.

I would say to the member for Oriole, though, that I don't know why members of the official opposition talk about centrally imposed sectoral agreements, if those were her words. These are not imposed sectoral agreements; they are agreements reached through bargaining with the employees, employers and the government. That's not centrally imposed. They don't have to sign sectoral agreements. There is an incentive to do so, but even if there's a sectoral agreement arrived at, there's nothing that compels locals to sign on to that sectoral agreement.

It's not imposed on anybody, and to say we should just withdraw the bill is to somehow ignore the enormity of the problem we have, called \$2 billion, and to say it's going to be achieved through simply the traditional way in which collective bargaining goes on, ignores what's gone on for the last couple of months.

There's nothing I would like more than on August 1 to have all eight sectoral agreements in place voluntarily signed and agreed to by the various sectors and the representatives from employers, employees and the government, so that you would have voluntary agreements all across the province in all eight sectors so the fail-safe wouldn't apply. I understand that, nothing would make me happier, but I think to assume or to pretend, even, that would be the case if we withdrew the bill, simply flies in the face of reality and what's gone on in the last several months.

One of the members of the third party was commenting on the fact that if it's an NDP government bringing in this bill, it must be a serious problem that we're facing. I think that's fair comment, for this government to be bringing in this kind of bill. I acknowledge that. It's extremely difficult for us to be proceeding with this kind of bill, but I can tell you that in my view the principles this bill overrides are overridden themselves by the principles that are maintained, ie, protection of vulnerable people all across the province by the continued provision of essential services to people who are the most vulnerable, and to the protection of jobs in the public sector.

We could withdraw this bill and take \$2 billion out of transfers to everyone out there in the province, reduce services accordingly all across the province. That would mean fewer jobs in the public sector: 20,000, 30,000, maybe 40,000 fewer jobs. That would mean some very vulnerable people who need the services out there would not get them because of the reduction in services. For members to pretend that we could just withdraw the bill and the problem will go away and it'll

all be resolved, really is not dealing with it in a very fair and upfront way, because there's no reason to believe that that would be the case.

1730

**Mr Cousens:** Just to close it off so that we can deal with the other amendments, I in part agree with the concern expressed by the member for Oriole that it is a tragically flawed piece of legislation. I don't think there's any doubt that it's going to lead to problems along the way, and I don't doubt that the government may well withdraw this before two years are up; maybe it can if the economy improves and other things come to life.

Notwithstanding that, we're living in a situation where we in Ontario have a problem, and in opposition we can continue to criticize all we want, but if we can help with the solution, as painful as it is, our caucus is determined to work with the government to try to find ways of improving this legislation. We have over 25 amendments now that we have tabled, and this is part of those amendments.

Undoubtedly, you're no different from anyone else, where it's all piled up on our desks today and you haven't had time to read it, but I put them into Hansard yesterday. We have done a number of things with this bill that will give it long-term benefit, that will cause the minister to be very restricted in some of his activities, because we can put into the bill technical data that force the minister to act in a certain way. We've called for a review of government programs and services. We've called for a different approach rather than the 12 days off, which is just going to have a surge on other costs.

So there are many elements to our amendments. This fits into it in part; it is just one small part to the overall perspective that we have. If possible, we'd like to see this amendment voted on and proceed with the others, because we're losing time.

**Mr Phillips:** It is an important amendment, and I just want to reply to something the Minister of Finance said, that this is always the risk with government. I realize we face a very tough financial situation. I realize that we have to deal with it; there is no question of that. But I'd just say to you that for literally decades ahead, Minister, your words will be used when people say, "Back in 1993 they had a fiscal problem and that overrode some very basic rights."

In this particular case, Minister, you and you alone will finally designate whether a sectoral agreement is a sectoral agreement, you and you alone have the \$400-million incentive, or hammer, and you and you alone can determine whether or not there is that consensus.

It is an important part of the bill, and that's why we have so much difficulty with this bill. I won't go over



the option we had before. It's clear the three parties have a difference of opinion. The government believes this is a good bill, the third party believes that with amendments it can be a good bill, and we believe it's a fundamentally flawed bill.

I happen to believe that tomorrow the Conservatives and the Liberals will vote against the bill. I hope some of the NDP caucus has a chance to really think about it. I hope they might also vote against the bill.

The amendment by the Conservatives, by the way, without the minister having the discretion for the bill—there's no other way for the sectoral agreements, I gather, to be approved. We have a fundamental agreement with the sectoral agreements, but if this amendment passes there is no other part of the bill where a sectoral agreement could be approved. I don't have any difficulty in voting against the amendment, with the backdrop that we fundamentally believe this bill is a bad piece of legislation. To repeat ourselves, we'll be voting against it. If we were to support this amendment, no sectoral agreements could ever be approved, I gather.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I get the sense that members would like to vote on the amendment put by the member for Markham, and then I have an amendment to subsection 11(3) and perhaps I could make some more general remarks at that time.

**The Chair:** Further questions or comments on the amendment to subsection 11(3) of the bill?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Perhaps we might deal with his amendment first, because I have an amendment to subsection 11(3). It's up to you.

**The Chair:** Shall the amendment to subsection 11(3) of the bill carry?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm sorry. Are we voting on the amendment put by the member for Markham?

**Mr Cousens:** Yes.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** All right, then we are voting against that.

**The Chair:** All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Therefore, we will stack the vote.

Mr Cousens, you have another amendment.

**Mr Stockwell:** It's the government amendment to 11(3).

**The Chair:** No, it's the Progressive Conservative motion.

**Mr Cousens:** Mr Chairman, the order has got reversed. The next amendment on section 11 is the government amendment.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Mr Chairman, I have an

amendment to paragraph 11(3)3.

**The Chair:** We've just noticed here that the motion presented by the Progressive Conservative is the first one to go. That's the first one we must debate. The reason for this, if you look under section 11, is that your amendment, Mr Cousens, is paragraph 11(3)1 of the bill. The one presented by the minister is paragraphs 3 and 5. Therefore, you are the first one.

**Mr Cousens:** We've dealt with mine. That's what we just voted on. So the next one now is the minister's.

**The Chair:** No, we voted on something else.

**Mr Cousens:** I apologize. I move that the bill be amended by striking out paragraph 1 of subsection 11(3) and substituting the following:

"1. The plan is supported by fifty per cent of the employers who among them employ at least fifty per cent of the employees in the sector for which the plan is to be designated as the sectoral framework."

I referred to this in the earlier amendment and this is consequent to it; that is, by having first of all limited the powers of the minister, if we'd been able to remove "in his opinion," then this would have been a way of ensuring what a sectoral framework would have been.

None the less, even although he has his opinions and that amendment didn't carry, this amendment is still valid, because what we would then call for is that before the minister can have an opinion that may not be based on numbers that are meaningful or realistic—and this is almost in the intent that the minister gave in answer to my question, a week ago today almost, in the standing committee on finance and economic affairs. I asked him the very question that led to this amendment: "What freedom then do you have to do what you want when you want?" You gave back an answer that showed good intent, that you would only do it if a majority of those who are part of that sector were going to be in favour of it. What I've done is to take that intention that you expressed at that time and put it into these words. It means that by the bill itself you're limiting what you will do and can do.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I probably inappropriately in addressing the previous amendment addressed this one in anticipation, in great anticipation of this one, and commented that the 50% rule that's in this amendment would be I think wrong if you had a couple of large employers in this sector representing over 50% of the employees but not 50% of the employers.

Therefore, you'd be saying to that whole sector and all the employees in it, "Even though more than 50% of you employees want this sectoral agreement because of reduced targets and so forth, you can't have it because there are not 50% of the employers who have signed on to the sectoral agreement." I think that would be not in the best interests of anyone. You'd save the government money, I suppose, but that's not the purpose. The

purpose was to encourage the voluntary agreements before August 1 by offering incentives.

1740

For those reasons, I really think it would not accomplish what even—I don't want to assume what he would think—he would like to see, namely, that a sectoral agreement could be hamstrung completely because of a small number of people holding it up, despite the fact that more than 50% of the employees were represented and had signed on to the agreement.

**Mr Cousens:** But that really is the point, and indeed what we really are saying is that if the minister is going to make a determination about a sectoral agreement, the minister have at least as a minimal guideline that there be 50% of that sector in agreement.

If the minister wanted to play politics on this, and I don't think he is today, but there would be days that he might, if he just wanted to say, "Look, we're moving in a progressive way towards a resolution within that sector," he could decide, "Well, roughly 25% or some municipalities are coming into it. Hey, I just think I'll move with it."

I'm really just trying to give it a clear idea of when you are making progress towards a sectoral agreement. In that sense, it shouldn't limit any successes anywhere. It really has a way of saying that you've got a minimal line to cross to say that you're beginning to have some success at all.

**Mr Stockwell:** I just want to add to that. It seems to me very clear in the democratic process we're engaged in here, regardless of the size of the employers or the employees, that if you can't, through a sectoral agreement, guarantee yourself 50% support within that sector, then I doubt very much that the plan can be adopted and designated as a sectoral framework. Now, I don't know who would argue against that.

This is very clear. It says, "The plan is supported by fifty per cent of the employers who among them employ at least fifty per cent of the employees in the sector for which the plan is to be designated as the sectoral framework."

The thrust of this is clear. If the minister is going to designate a sectoral framework, there's only one precursor, there's only one condition, and that condition is what every democratic person, every fairminded individual would hope would be there, that the majority approve of it, and if they don't, I would hate to think the minister is going to designate sectoral frameworks when the majority don't agree.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'm concerned about the amendment as put by the third party. It reads that in order for it to be a sectoral agreement, "The plan is supported by fifty per cent of the employers"—employers. No mention of employees at all.

**Mr Cousens:** It does. In the next line. Keep going.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** —"who among them employ at least fifty per cent of the employees in the sector." It doesn't say that the plan is supported by the employees; it just says "employers." I think that would be inappropriate.

But if I could go one step further, if it was supported by less than 50% of the employers and you had sign-on by the employees and those employers represented 80% of the employees, this would rule it an invalid sectoral agreement because you didn't have 50% of the employers, because there might be a large number of small employers, so you wouldn't be able to recognize that agreement as legitimate because you didn't have 50% of the employers. I don't think that's what the member would want.

**Mr Stockwell:** To entertain the first point with respect to employees, it goes on to say in the amendment "who among them employ at least fifty per cent of the employees." Mr Finance Minister, as I understand your legislation, it says that it can't come before you and be designated as a sectoral framework unless they have agreement. By its very nature it's before you because 50% of the employers who equal 50% of the employees have an agreement.

That argument you made is a red herring. It's not before you unless they have 50% of the employees that they've got an agreement with, and that's the only reason it's before you, to designate it as a sectoral agreement. So that makes your first argument a red herring.

The second point is, you said there could be small groups. Well, of course. What is this doing? This whole piece of legislation and what you're trying to do here is to ensure fairness and protection of smaller work areas. It would seem to me, Mr Finance Minister, that if you're trying to be fair—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** I didn't quite understand that. Explain that one again.

**Mr Stockwell:** Tony didn't understand it, but I hope you did, so I'll carry on. You can explain it to him later.

What I think would be fair is that no matter how small you are, you've got to live within the framework of your legislation.

**The Chair:** Order. Your time is up. Sorry.

It is now 5:45, and according to the terms of the order of the House dated July 5, 1993, all remaining amendments are deemed to have been moved. I shall now put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections and amendments.

Shall Mr Cousens's amendment to subsection 11(3) carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."



In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall the amendment to subsection 11(3) proposed by the government carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall the amendment to subsection 11(3) carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

**Mr Cousens:** Mr Chairman, just to be clear, that motion you're referring to, is that paragraph 5 of the bill you're referring to?

**The Chair:** Subsection 11(3), paragraph 3.

**Mr Cousens:** Well, there are several on 11(3). I just wanted to be clear as to which one it is you're referring to. Maybe it would be best if we read each of them in as we go along.

**The Chair:** Mr Cousens moves that:

"For purposes of clarity, an employee who is temporarily or permanently laid off in accordance with the provisions of a collective agreement or in accordance with employer policy or practice shall be deemed not to be adversely affected."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with Mr Cousens's amendment to subsection 11(3), paragraph 5, and it reads as follows:

"I move that the bill be amended by striking out paragraph 5 of subsection 11(3)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with Mr Cousens's amendment to subsection 11(4), which reads as follows:

"I move that the bill be amended by striking out subsection 11(4)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

1750

We're dealing with section 12 and the Progressive Conservative amendment.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** On a point of order, if I might, Mr Chair: The government had an amendment to 11(3), which was tabled.

**The Chair:** Yes, I did mention it, 11(3)5.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** You've done it? Okay.

**The Chair:** Yes, it's been deferred.

We'll now deal with section 12. The amendment from the Conservatives on section 12 is out of order.

**Mr Cousens:** Are you saying that the motion about striking out section 12 is out of order?

**The Chair:** That's correct.

Shall section 12 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

Section 13, amendment brought in by the Conservatives to section 13(6):

"Notwithstanding 13(5), where there is a sectoral framework that relates to the sector of the employer and where in the opinion of the minister the employer has made all reasonable efforts to enter into a local agreement with one or more bargaining agent(s), the minister shall designate the sectoral framework as the local agreement(s) between the employer and the bargaining agent(s)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with section 14, an amendment brought by the Progressive Conservatives, subsection 14(2), paragraph 2, which reads as follows:

"For purposes of clarity an employee who is temporarily or permanently laid off in accordance with the provisions of a collective agreement or in accordance with employer policy or practice shall be deemed not to be adversely affected."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with the government amendment to subsection 14(2), paragraphs 2 and 4, which reads:

"The agreement will not adversely affect employees who earn less than \$30,000 annually, excluding over-time pay.

"The agreement will be fair and equitable in its application to all employees."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with the government amendment to subsection 15(2).

*Interjections.*

**The Chair:** Order, please.

"Conflict with collective agreement

"The provisions of a local agreement prevail over the provisions of a collective agreement."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with section 16, Conservative amendment to subsection 16(3), paragraph 2:

"For purposes of clarity an employee who is temporarily or permanently laid off in accordance with the provisions of a collective agreement or in accordance with employer policy or practice shall be deemed not to be adversely affected."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with a government amendment to subsection 16(3), paragraphs 2 and 4:

"The plan will not adversely affect employees who earn less than \$30,000 annually, excluding overtime pay.

"The plan established under subsection (1) will be fair and equitable in its application to all employees."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall sections 17 through 21 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The motion is carried.

We'll now deal with section 22, government motion, amendment to subsections 22(2) and (4):

"Actions of an employer taken in accordance with a non-bargaining unit plan shall not be the subject of any

proceeding brought by any person against an employer.

"Subsections (2) and (3)"—

**Mrs Caplan:** What's fair about that, Floyd? Take away their rights. Wipe out individual rights.

**The Chair:** Order, please—"apply only if the actions taken by the employer would have been authorized under section 24, 25 or 26 if part VII applied to the employer's non-bargaining unit employees."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with the government amendment to subsection 23(2):

"This part does not apply to employees who earn less than \$30,000 annually, excluding overtime pay."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with the Progressive Conservatives' amendment to subsection 23(2):

"That the bill be amended by striking out subsection 23(2)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with the Progressive Conservatives' amendment, subsection 23(3):

"Nothing in this part prevents an employer from laying off either permanently or temporarily an employee described in subsection 23(2)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We will now deal with section 24, an amendment brought by the government to subsection 24(4):

"An increase in compensation after June 14, 1993"—

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Dispense.

**The Chair:** Dispense?

**Mr Stockwell:** Read it in.

**The Chair:** "An increase in compensation after June 14, 1993 under a collective agreement existing on that date is void.



"Despite subsection (4), a bargaining agent, by written notice to the employer, may elect to preserve increases in compensation provided for in a collective agreement existing on June 14, 1993, other than compensation described in clause (2)(a), (b) or (c).

"The notice of the election must be delivered to the employer not later than when the bargaining agent gives notice to the employer to bargain a renewal or new collective agreement which may extend beyond March 31, 1996.

"If an election is made under subsection (4.1),

"any increase in compensation shall be deferred until the third anniversary following the day on which it would have occurred under the collective agreement; and

"no increase in compensation, other than those preserved by the election, shall be given before the third anniversary following the day the collective agreement expires, or, if the collective agreement has been extended under section 33.1, before the third anniversary of the day it would have expired had it not been extended.

"An employee is not entitled to any increases in compensation after March 31, 1996, by way of,

"merit increases;

"cost-of-living increases or other similar movement of or through ranges; or

"increases resulting from any movements on any pay scale or other grid system, except as prescribed by regulation,

"in respect of employment during the period beginning June 14, 1993, and ending March 31, 1996."

**1800**

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We will now deal with the government amendment to subsection 24(6):

"(6) Despite subsection (1), if employees are represented by a bargaining agent that,

"(a) was certified or recognized as the employees' bargaining agent before June 14, 1993; or

"(b) applied for certification as the employees' bargaining agent before June 14, 1993,

"and a first collective agreement comes into force on or after June 14, 1993, the rate of compensation of an employee to whom the first collective agreement applies is, for the period beginning on the day the first collective agreement comes into force and ending with March 31, 1996, fixed at the rate first payable under the first collective agreement."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with the Progressive Conservative amendment to section 24.

"24(1) Subject to subsection (4) the rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning on the first anniversary of the agreement falling on or after August 1, 1993, fixed at a rate 5% lower than the rate that was in effect immediately before that anniversary.

"(2) Subject to subsections (4) and (7), the rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is not bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning August 1, 1993, fixed at a rate 5% lower than the rate that was in effect immediately before August 1, 1993.

"(3) An amount that is payable by the crown in right of Ontario or by the government of Ontario to an employer for compensation purposes shall be reduced by 5% on the first anniversary date of the collective agreement falling on or after August 1, 1993, in the case of employees subject to a collective agreement or on August 1, 1993, in the case of employees not bound by a collective agreement and shall be fixed at the reduced level for a period of three years from that date.

"(4) During the three-year period established by subsections (1) and (2) employers and employees may apply any wage savings realized as a result of improvements in productivity and the elimination of waste and inefficiency to financing compensation increases with the amount and distribution of the increase to be negotiated by the employers and the employees.

"(5) Nothing in this section prevents increases in compensation as a result of a promotion or acting promotion of an employee to a different position.

"(6) If a collective agreement existing on August 1, 1993, provides for increases in compensation after that date, those increases are cancelled.

"(7) If a collective agreement has expired before August 1, 1993, and on that date the employees that were formerly bound by it are without a collective agreement, the compensation of these employees is fixed at 5% less than the amount they were receiving under the last collective agreement in force before August 1, 1993.

"(8) If employees are represented by a bargaining agent and a first collective agreement has not been concluded before August 1, 1993, the compensation of those employees is fixed at an amount 5% less than the amount they were receiving immediately before August

1, 1993.”

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We are now dealing with a government amendment to subsection 24(4).

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I may have my numbers a little out. Will you be dealing with our alternate amendments, since that other one didn't carry? Maybe you can just clarify.

**The Chair:** Sorry. We are dealing with the Conservatives' amendment to section 24.

“24(1) The rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning on the first anniversary of the commencement of the agreement falling on or after August 1, 1993, fixed at the rate that was in effect immediately before that anniversary.

“(2) Subject to subsection (6), the rate of compensation of an employee who on August 1, 1993, is not bound by a collective agreement is, for a period of three years beginning August 1, 1993, fixed at the rate that was in effect immediately before August 1, 1993.

“(3) For greater certainty, ‘compensation’ in this section includes,

“(a) merit increases;

“(b) cost-of-living increases or other similar movement of or through ranges; and

“(c) increases resulting from any movements on any pay scale or other grid system.

“(4) Nothing in this section prevents increases in compensation as a result of a promotion or acting promotion of an employee to a different position.

“(5) If a collective agreement existing on August 1, 1993, provides for increases in compensation after that date, those increases are suspended.

“(6) If a collective agreement has expired before August 1, 1993, and on that date the employees that were formerly bound by it are without a collective agreement, the compensation of those employees is fixed at the amount they were receiving under the last collective agreement in force before August 1, 1993.

“(7) If employees are represented by a bargaining agent and a first collective agreement has not been concluded before August 1, 1993, the compensation of those employees is fixed at the amount they were receiving immediately before August 1, 1993.

“(8) The compensation of an employee who starts employment after August 1, 1993 is fixed at the starting amount until July 31, 1996.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

**1810**

We're now dealing with a Progressive Conservative amendment to section 24 of the bill.

“The rate of compensation of an employee is, for the period beginning August 1, 1993, and ending with July 31, 1996, fixed at the rate that was in effect immediately before August 1, 1994.

“For greater certainty, ‘compensation’ in this section includes,

“merit increases;

“cost-of-living increases or other similar movement of or through ranges; and

“increases resulting from any movement on any pay scale or other grid system.

“Nothing in this section prevents increases in compensation as a result of a promotion or acting promotion of an employee to a different position.

“If a collective agreement existing on August 1, 1993, provides for an increase in compensation after that date, those increases are cancelled.

“If a collective agreement has expired before August 1, 1993, and on that date the employees that were formerly bound by it are without a collective agreement, the compensation of these employees is fixed at the amount they were receiving under the last collective agreement in force before August 1, 1993.

“If employees are represented by a bargaining agent and a first collective agreement has not been concluded before August 1, 1993, the compensation of those employees is fixed at the amount they were receiving immediately before August 1, 1993.

“The compensation of an employee who starts employment after the date on which this bill receives royal assent is fixed at the starting amount until July 31, 1996.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with the Progressive Conservatives' amendment to sections 25 through 32 of the bill.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Are we dealing with 24(4), Mr Chairman, if you are moving to Conservative motion 25?

**The Chair:** We dealt with subsections 24(4) and 24(6). Section 25 now. We're dealing with the Progressive Conservatives' amendment to sections 25 to 32.



"Subject to subsection (2), no employer shall, during the period of three years beginning on the date on which this act receives royal assent, employ any person who was not employed by the employer immediately before that date.

"An employer may employ a person described in subsection (1),

"if it is necessary for the employer to do so in order to comply with a provision of an act of the Legislature or the Parliament of Canada or a regulation made under such an act that requires the employer to employ a specified number of employees; or

"if the employer would not be able to provide an essential service unless the employer employed the person.

"Clause (2)(b) does not apply to allow an employer to employ a person unless the position in which the person would be employed is one that has been designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or is one that is a member of a class of positions that has been so designated."

I wonder if you could keep your conversation low.

"In this section, 'essential service' means a service that is necessary to enable the employer to prevent,

"danger to life, health or safety;

"the destruction or serious deterioration of machinery, equipment or premises;

"serious environmental damage;

"disruption of the administration of the courts; or

"disruption of any publicly funded service."

I wonder if you could keep your conversations lower.

"A committee to be named the expenditure review committee in English and comité d'examen des dépenses in French is established.

"The committee shall be composed of three persons appointed by the Minister of Finance, one of whom shall be designated by the minister as chair of the committee.

"The minister shall not appoint any person who is a member of the Legislative Assembly or an employee of the crown.

"The appointments shall be made not later than September 1, 1993.

"If any member of the committee becomes unable to continue to serve on the committee, the Minister of Finance may appoint a substitute.

"The committee shall,

"conceive of a method of preventing administrative units of the government of Ontario that have their own budgets from attempting to spend to the limit of their budgets if such spending is not necessary to the performance of the tasks assigned to the units, particularly where such spending would occur near the end of a

fiscal year;

"conceive of a method of protecting employees of government institutions from reprisal on the part of the institutions for having disclosed the existence of acts or omissions that constitute gross mismanagement or that cause a waste of money or other resources;

"conceive of a method of rewarding employees of government institutions who, individually or collectively, make recommendations that lead to a reduction of expenditures or a conservation of resources through the elimination of waste or an increase in the efficiency or cost-effectiveness of the operations of the institutions; and

"review all programs administered and services provided by the government of Ontario and identify any programs or services that should, having regard to the desirability of efficient and cost-effectiveness, be,

"eliminated,

"reduced in scope or scale, or

"transferred to the private sector.

"The committee shall submit a report to the Legislative Assembly,

"on the matters referred to in clause (6)(a), on or before December 31, 1993;

"on the matters referred to in clauses (6)(b) and (c), on or before March 31, 1994; and

"on the matters referred to in clause (6)(d), on or before March 31, 1995.

"In subsection (6), 'government institution' has the same meaning as 'institution' has in the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with a Progressive Conservative amendment subsection 25(5).

Subsection 25(5) of the bill be amended by adding after the words "unpaid leaves of absence" in line two the words "provided no person is employed or assigned to replace the employee on unpaid leave" so that the subsection would now read:

"If a collective agreement provides for unpaid leaves of absence, provided no person is employed or assigned to replace the employee on unpaid leave, or other temporary lay-offs, the employer must utilize those provisions before requiring unpaid leaves under subsection (1)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with a government amendment to subsection 25(5), which reads that subsection 25(5) of the bill be struck out.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

I declare the motion carried.

*Interjections.*

**The Chair:** I did say the motion carried.

*Interjections.*

**The Chair:** All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

1820

We will deal with the government amendment to subsections 26(6) and (7).

"For the purpose of clause (5)(a), the employer shall make all reasonable efforts to accommodate an employee's request for compensating days off."

**Interjection:** Dispense.

**The Chair:** Dispense?

**Mr Cousens:** No. I don't seem to have it. What number is it again that you're reading in?

**The Chair:** Subsections 26(6) and (7).

**Mr Cousens:** I don't have that amendment. Was that in by 4 o'clock? No, I'm serious. It's not on my list.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Last week.

**Mr Cousens:** That's why; the list isn't merged.

**The Chair:** Yes, it was in.

"Despite clause (5)(c), compensating days off may be converted to money for an employee who ceases to be employed by the employer."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with the government amendment to subsection 27(2), paragraph 2.

"Employees will not be required to take an unpaid leave of absence to the extent that it would result in their annual earnings, excluding overtime pay, being reduced to under \$30,000."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall sections 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The motion is carried.

We will now deal with section—

**Mr Stockwell:** You missed our five.

**The Chair:** Pardon me? There were not five; there were only two people standing up.

We are now dealing with section 32.1.

"An employee to whom a collective agreement applies may use the grievance or arbitration procedures under the collective agreement to decide any difference between the employee and his or her employer arising out of the interpretation, application, administration or alleged contravention of a program developed by the employer under this part.

"In a grievance or arbitration under subsection (1), the arbitrator or board of arbitration shall not make any decision that an adjudicator is entitled to make under subsection 31(2)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We will deal with a Progressive Conservative amendment to subsections 33(3) and (4), that the bill be amended by striking out subsections 33(3) and (4).

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll deal with a government amendment to subsection 33(4):

"Actions of an employer taken in accordance with section 24, 25 or 26 shall not be the subject of any proceeding brought by any person against an employer."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with a government motion to subsection 33(5):

"An employee has no right to grieve under the Public Service Act or any other act or a collective agreement



in respect of actions taken by his or her employer in accordance with section 24, 25 or 26."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with a government amendment to section 33.1:

"A bargaining agent may, by written notice to the employer of employees to whom this part applies, require that a collective agreement be extended to March 31, 1996, if the agreement was or is governed by an act that permits the employees to strike.

"The notice may be given before or after the collective agreement expires.

"The giving of the notice extends an existing collective agreement or, in the case of a collective agreement that has expired, revives and extends the expired agreement to March 31, 1996.

"This section applies despite subsections 33(1) and (2) and is subject to,

"regulations excluding from the application of this section collective agreement provisions respecting staffing levels or workplace restructuring; and

"subsections 24(4) to (5).

"This section is not limited to collective agreements that expire after June 14, 1993."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with a government amendment to sections 33.2 to 33.7:

"Despite subsection 11(2), the minister may"—

**Interjection:** Dispense.

**The Chair:** Dispense? Dispensed.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We'll now deal with the Progressive Conservatives' amendment to section 34:

"The prescribed amount referred shall not in respect of any employer exceed the expenditure reduction target determined under section 7."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We now deal with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 35(1):

"The prescribed amount referred shall not in respect of any employer exceed the expenditure reduction target determined under section 7."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say 'aye.'

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

**1830**

We will now deal with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 36(1):

"An amount that is payable by the Ontario health insurance plan for an insured service rendered by a physician or practitioner or in or by a health facility may be reduced by the amount which the joint management committee determines is necessary to achieve a reduction in total OHIP fee payments equal in percentage terms to the compensation reductions in other sectors."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're dealing with another Progressive Conservative amendment, to subsection 36(2) of the bill:

That the bill be amended by adding following the words "prescribed amount" the words "to a maximum of 5 per cent."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 36(3):

That the bill be amended by adding following the words "prescribed amount" the words "to a maximum of 5 per cent."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Stacked vote.

We're now dealing with another Progressive Conservative amendment, to subsection 36(4) of the bill:

That the bill be amended by adding following the words "prescribed amount" the words "to a maximum of 5 per cent."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 37(1):

"If a maximum amount payable by the Ontario health insurance plan in respect of services rendered by a physician, practitioner or health facility during a given time period has been established by agreement, the maximum may be reduced by an amount to be negotiated by the joint management committee but the amount of the reduction shall not exceed 5 per cent."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 37(2):

That the bill be amended by adding following the words "the prescribed amount" the words "but shall not exceed 5 per cent."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall section 38 carry? Carried.

We now deal with the government amendment to section 39:

That the bill be amended by striking out "35" in the second line and by inserting "the requirement to make a payment under section 35" after "37" in the same line."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 40(2):

That subsection 40(2) of the bill be amended by striking out the word "suspended" in line eight and substituting the words "null and void."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with a government motion to subsections 40(3) and (4):

"Despite subsection (1), an arbitration award or decision may increase the annual earnings of employees to a maximum of \$30,000.

"Despite subsection (1), an arbitration award or decision may increase compensation to an employee to the extent required to redress any improper denial of a promotion or improper classification."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're dealing with another government amendment, to subsection 40(4.1):

"(4.1) Subsection (1) does not apply to an arbitration award or decision that settles a first collective agreement applicable to employees represented by a bargaining agent that,

"(a) was certified or recognized as the employees' bargaining agent before June 14, 1993; or

"(b) applied for certification as the employee's bargaining agent before June 14, 1993."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with a Progressive Conservative motion, an amendment to clause 41(1)(e), that the bill be amended by striking out clause 41(1)(e) and substituting the following:

"(e) designating a position or class of positions for the purposes of subsection 25(3)."

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

We're now dealing with a government motion, subsections 41(3), (5) and (6).

"(3) A regulation made under subsection (1) may be made retroactive to such date, not earlier than June 14, 1993, as is set out in the regulation.

"(5) A regulation made under clauses (1)(f) or (g) is not effective to reduce an amount payable referred to in section 36 or 37 if an agreement reciting that it is made



for the purpose of this act is made between the government of Ontario and the physician, practitioner, health facility, health service organization, other person or entity referred to in subsection 36(2), independent health facility or operator of a pharmacy concerned or his, her or its agent before August 2, 1993.

“(6) A regulation made under clause (1)(k) is not effective to increase a threshold payment adjustment referred to in subsection 38(1) or to reduce a threshold level referred to in subsection 38(2) if an agreement reciting that it is made for the purpose of this act is made between the government of Ontario and the Ontario Medical Association before August 2, 1993.

“(7) An agreement referred to in subsection (5) or (6) that needs to be ratified shall be deemed to have been made before August 2, 1993, for the purpose of this act, if it is signed before that date by the parties to it and ratified not later than August 10, 1993.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall sections 42 to 46 carry? Carried.

1840

We’ll now deal with section 47 and an amendment brought by the government to subsections 47(2), (3) and (4). Dispense?

**Mr Stockwell:** No, read it in.

**The Chair:** “Any power or duty conferred or imposed on the administrator or an adjudicator may be delegated by the administrator or adjudicator, as the case may be, to a person designated by him or her and, when purporting to exercise a delegated power or duty, the delegate shall be presumed conclusively to act in accordance with the delegation.

“A delegation under this section shall be in writing and may be subject to such limitations, conditions and requirements as are set out in it.

“In a delegation under this section, the minister, administrator or adjudicator may authorize a person to whom a power or duty is delegated to delegate to others the exercise of the delegated power or duty, subject to such limitations, conditions and requirements as the person may impose.

“The minister, administrator or an adjudicator may authorize the use of a facsimile of his or her signature on any document except an affidavit or statutory declaration and may authorize a person to whom a power or duty is delegated under this section to authorize the use of a facsimile of that person’s signature on any document except an affidavit or statutory declaration.

“A facsimile signature referred to in subsection (5)

shall be deemed to be the signature of the person who authorized its use.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 47, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall section 48 carry? Carried.

We will now deal with section 49, a government amendment to subsection 49(1):

“Subject to subsection (2), this act, except subsections”—dispense?

**Mr Stockwell:** No.

**The Chair:** —“24(4.3) and (4.4) and section 43, is repealed on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The vote is stacked.

We’ll now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion to section 49.1:

“The Minister of Finance, for as long as this act is in force, shall table in the Legislative Assembly an annual report on the progress made by the government and the sectors toward meeting the expenditure reduction targets, any recommendations concerning adjustments to those targets which in the opinion of the minister are warranted, estimates of the number of jobs lost as a consequence of measures implemented pursuant to the act and any other information which, in the opinion of the minister, is relevant to providing the Legislative Assembly, the sectors and the public with an objective assessment of the effectiveness of the restraints imposed by this act.”

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The vote is stacked.

Shall section 50 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The preamble is carried.

Now we’ll deal with the schedule.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

We've made a slight mistake here.

Shall section 51 carry? Carried.

We will now call in the members. It's a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1847 to 1852.*

**The Chair:** We'll now deal with the government's amendment to section 2.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing. This is a government amendment to section 2. Thank you. Please take your seats.

All those opposed to the motion? Thank you.

The ayes are 81; the nays are 21. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 2, as amended, carry and be part of the bill?

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing.

Same vote. The ayes are 81; the nays are 21. I declare the motion carried.

We are now dealing with a government amendment to section 5.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

My mistake. We have to do a vote first on section 3 and section 4. Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing. Same vote?

The ayes are 81; the nays are 21. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with the government amendment to add subsections 5(3) and (4).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

Same vote?

The ayes are 81; the nays are 21. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 5, as amended, carry? Carried.

We're now dealing with section 6, the government's amendment to section 6.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise. Same vote?

The ayes are 81; the nays are 21. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 6, as amended, carry? Carried.

We'll now deal with section 7, the amendment by the Progressive Conservatives to subsections 7(5) and (6).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing. Same vote reversed? No?

All those opposed please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the amendment lost.

Shall section 7 carry? Carried.

We now deal with section 11, a Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 11(3).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing. Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Another amendment to subsection 11(3) placed by the Progressive Conservatives. Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

A government motion this time to subsection 11(3), paragraphs 3 and 5. Same vote reversed? No?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

#### 1900

We are now dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 11(3), paragraph 3.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We now deal with the Progressive Conservative motion, subsection 11(3), paragraph 5.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing. Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Another amendment by the Progressive Conservatives, subsection 11(4). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 11, as amended, carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 12 carry?

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion



carried.

We are now dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 13(6).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 16; the nays are 86. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 13 carry?

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We are now dealing with the Conservative amendment to paragraph 14(2)2.

All those in favour of the amendment will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We are now dealing with the government amendment to paragraphs 14(2)2 and 4.

All those in favour of the amendment will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 14, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

We now deal with section 15, a government amendment to subsection 15(2). Same vote?

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 15, as amended, carry? Carried.

We now deal with section 16, an amendment brought by the Progressive Conservatives, paragraph 16(3)2.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** Mr Chair, I said no because I wanted to vote on that particular clause; there was no vote on that clause, and I did say no. Perhaps you didn't hear me.

**The Chair:** You did say no? We didn't hear you. I apologize. If you did say no, we accept it. It was on section 15, as amended, correct?

Shall section 15, as amended, carry?

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain stand-

ing.

The ayes are 64; the nays are 38. I declare the motion carried.

**1910**

We'll now deal with section 16, a Conservative amendment to paragraph 16(3)2.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 16; the nays are 86. I declare the motion lost.

We are now dealing with a government amendment to paragraphs 16(3)2 and 4.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 16, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 65; the nays are 37. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 22, a government amendment to subsections 22(2) and (4).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 22, as amended, carry? Carried.

Section 23, a government amendment to subsection 23(2).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with a Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 23(2).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We're now dealing with the Progressive Conservative amendment to subsection 23(3). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 23, as amended, carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 24, a government amendment, subsection 24(4). Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with the government motion, subsection 24(6). Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with the Conservative amendment to subsection 24.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Now, the Conservative amendment to subsection 24. Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

The Conservative amendment to subsection 24. Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 24, as amended, carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed to the motion will rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 25, a Conservative amendment to sections 25 to 32.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We're now dealing with an amendment brought in by the Conservatives to subsection 25(5). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

**1920**

We're now dealing with the government motion to subsection 25(5).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and

remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 25, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 26, a government motion to subsections 26(6) and (7). Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 26, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We are now dealing with section 27, a government amendment to paragraph 27(2)2. Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 27, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We are now dealing with the government amendment to section 32.1. Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 32.1 stand as part of the bill? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We now deal with section 33, the Conservative amendment to subsection 33(3) and (4).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We are now dealing with the government amendment to subsection 33(4).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We are now dealing with the government amendment to subsection 33(5). Same vote?

The ayes are 63, the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 33, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.



We now deal with the government amendment to section 33.1. Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We'll now deal with the government amendment to sections 33.2 to 33.7. Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall sections 33.1 through 33.7 stand as part of the bill? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 34, an amendment by Mr Cousens to section 34.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 34 carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 35, an amendment by the Progressive Conservatives to subsection 35(1).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 35 carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 36, an amendment brought in by the Conservatives to subsection 36(1).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Another amendment by the Conservatives to subsection 36(2): Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We're now dealing with another Conservative amendment to subsection 36(3). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Another amendment by the Conservatives to subsection 36(4): Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

**1930**

Another amendment by the Conservatives, to subsection 36(4). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 36 carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

A Conservative amendment to subsection 37(1).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

A Conservative amendment to subsection 37(2). Same vote?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 37 carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 39, the government amendment to section 39. Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 39, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 40, a Progressive Conservative amendment, subsection 40(2).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We're now dealing with a government amendment to subsections 40(3) and (4).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

The government amendment to subsection 40(4.1). Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 40, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 41, a Progressive Conservative amendment to clause 41(1)(e).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed?

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

We're now dealing with a government motion, subsections 41(3), (5) and (6).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Shall section 41, as amended, carry? Same vote?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

We're now dealing with section 47—we're now dealing with section 49, the government amendment to subsection 49(1).

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed?

The ayes are 63; the nays are 39. I declare the motion carried.

Treasurer?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I only question if we're certain that section 47 got passed.

**The Chair:** Yes, it was carried.

We were dealing with section 49. Shall section 49, as amended, carry?

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I think

what we really need to do is vote on our amendment, 49.1.

**The Chair:** The Conservative amendment is section 49.1. It's a new section of the bill; it's not part of section 49.

Shall section 49, as amended, carry?

**Mr Cousens:** I'm sorry. I don't recall having a chance to vote on 49.1, a motion prepared by the PC caucus.

**The Chair:** Mr Cousens, it's a brand-new section.

So are we clear on section 49? Carried.

Now let's deal with the Progressive Conservative amendment, section 49.1. Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 17; the nays are 85. I declare the motion lost.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 64; the nays are 38. I declare the motion carried.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Mr Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

**The Chair:** Shall the committee rise and report?

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

The ayes are 64; the nays are 38. I declare the motion carried.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

It being slightly past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1943.





## CONTENTS

Tuesday 6 July 1993

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE	
<b>Social Contract Act, 1993, Bill 48</b>	
Mr Laughren .....	2215
Mr Phillips .....	2215
Mr Harris .....	2215
Mr Stockwell .....	2216
Mrs Sullivan .....	2217
Mr Cousens .....	2217
Mr Jim Wilson .....	2218
Mr Beer .....	2219
Mr David Johnson .....	2219
Mr Murphy .....	2221
Mr Kwinter .....	2230
Mrs Caplan .....	2230
Mr McGuinty .....	2233
Mrs Haslam .....	2247

432100052









JUL 6 1994



